arXiv:0908.0401v2 [math.AG] 5 Dec 2009

TWO LOCAL INEQUALITIES

IVAN CHELTSOV

to the memory of Vasily Iskovskikh (1939–2009)

Abstract. Many results in algebraic geometry can be proved using local inequalities that relate singularities of divisors on algebraic varieties and their multiplicities. For example, the famous theorem of Iskovskikh and Manin about the nonrationality of every smooth quartic threefold can be derived from one such inequality. We prove two new local inequalities for divisors on smooth surfaces. Using orbifold multiplicities, we can apply one of these inequalities to divisors on two-dimensional orbifolds. We consider some applications of the obtained inequalities.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 5
3. Inequality I 12
4. Inequality II 19
5. Orbifolds 21
6. Icosahedron 35
Appendix A. Non-rationality 43
Appendix B. Cremona group 53
References 62

We assume that all varieties are projective, normal, and defined over $\mathbb{C}$.

1. Introduction

Let S be a surface, let O be a smooth point of S, let Δ_1 and Δ_2 be curves on S such that

$$O \in \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2,$$

both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are irreducible and reduced, both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are smooth at O, and Δ_1 intersects the curve Δ_2 transversally at the point O. Let a_1 and a_2 be rational numbers.

Theorem 1.1. Let D be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the surface S such that the log pair

$$\Big(S,\ D+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not log canonical at O. Suppose that $\Delta_1 \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(D) \not\supseteq \Delta_2$, $a_1 \geqslant 0$, $a_2 \geqslant 0$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_1\Big) > 1-a_2 \text{ or } \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_2\Big) > 1-a_1.$$

The author would like to thank I. Dolgachev, V. Golyshev, D. Kosta, Yu. Prokhorov and K. Shramov for useful comments and conversations. The would like to thank T. Dokchitser for the proof of Lemma B.21.

Proof. If $a_1 > 1$ and $a_2 > 1$, then we are done. So we may assume that $a_1 \leqslant 1$. Then

$$\Big(S,\ D+\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not log canonical at O. Then it follows from [19, Theorem 17.6] (see Lemma 2.18) that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(\big(D+a_2\Delta_2\big)\cdot\Delta_1\Big)>1,$$

which implies the required inequality. □

The following analogue of Theorem 1.1 is implicitly obtained in [22].

Theorem 1.2. Let D be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the surface S such that the log pair

$$\Big(S,\ D+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not log canonical at O. Suppose that $\Delta_1\not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(D)\not\supseteq\Delta_2$, $a_1\geqslant 0$, $a_2\geqslant 0$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_1\Big)>2a_1-a_2 \text{ or } \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_2\Big)>\frac{3}{2}a_2-a_1$$

if the inequality $a_1+a_2/2\leqslant 1$ holds.

We prove the following generalization of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in Section 3.

Theorem 1.3. Let D be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the surface S such that the log pair

$$\Big(S,\ D+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not log canonical at O. Suppose that $\Delta_1\not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(D)\not\supseteq\Delta_2$, $a_1\geqslant 0$, $a_2\geqslant 0$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_1\Big)>M+Aa_1-a_2 \text{ or } \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_2\Big)>N+Ba_2-a_1$$

if $\alpha a_1+\beta a_2\leqslant 1$, where $A, B, M, N, \alpha, \beta$ are non-negative rational numbers such that

- the inequalities $A(B-1)\geqslant 1\geqslant \max(M,N)$ hold,
- the inequalities $\alpha(A+M-1)\geqslant A^2(B+N-1)\beta$ and $\alpha(1-M)+A\beta\geqslant A$ hold,
- either the inequality $2M+AN\leqslant 2$ holds or

$$\alpha\big(B+1-MB-N\big)+\beta\big(A+1-AN-M\big)\geqslant AB-1.$$

We consider several applications of Theorem 1.3 in Section 5.

Remark 1.4. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

The following result is obtained in [10] (cf. [17, Lemma 3.3]).

Theorem 1.5. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a linear system on the surface S that does not have fixed components, and let ϵ be a positive rational number. Suppose that the log pair

$$\Big(S,\ \epsilon\mathcal{M}+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not Kawamata log terminal at the point O. Let M_1 and M_2 be general curves in $\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\begin{cases}\dfrac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } a_1\geqslant 0 \text{ or } a_2\geqslant 0,\\ \dfrac{4\big(1-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } a_1\leqslant 0 \text{ and } a_2\leqslant 0.\end{cases}\tag{1.6}$$

and if the inequality 1.6 is an equality, then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)=\frac{2(a_1-1)}{\epsilon},$$

the log pair $(S,\epsilon\mathcal{M}+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2)$ is log canonical, and $a_1=a_2\geqslant 0$.

Proof. Let us show how to prove the inequality 1.6 (see the proof of [17, Lemma 3.3]).

Let $\phi\colon \bar{S}\to S$ be a blow up of the point O, let E be the exceptional curve of ϕ. Then

$$K_{\bar{S}}+\epsilon\bar{\mathcal{M}}+a_1\bar{\Delta}_1+a_2\bar{\Delta}_2+\Big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+a_1+a_2-1\Big)E\equiv\phi^*\Big(K_S+\epsilon\mathcal{M}+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, $\bar{\Delta}_1$, $\bar{\Delta}_2$ are proper transforms of $\mathcal{M}$, Δ_1, Δ_2 on the surface $\bar{S}$, respectively.

Let M_1 and M_2 be general curves in the linear system $\mathcal{M}$, let $\bar{M}_1$ and $\bar{M}_2$ be the proper transforms of the curves $\bar{M}_1$ and $\bar{M}_2$ on the surface $\bar{S}$, respectively.

Suppose that $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})\geqslant 2-a_1-a_2$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O(\mathcal{M})\geqslant\frac{\big(2-a_1-a_2\big)^2}{\epsilon^2}\geqslant\begin{cases}\dfrac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\ \text{if } a_1\geqslant 0 \text{ or } a_2\geqslant 0,\\ \dfrac{4\big(1-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\ \text{if } a_1\leqslant 0 \text{ and } a_2\leqslant 0,\end{cases}$$

which implies the inequality 1.6 in the case when $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})\geqslant 2-a_1-a_2$.

To complete the proof we may assume that $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})<2-a_1-a_2$. Then the log pair

$$\Bigg(\bar{S},\ \epsilon\bar{\mathcal{M}}+a_1\bar{\Delta}_1+a_2\bar{\Delta}_2+\Big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+a_1+a_2-1\Big)E\Bigg)$$

is not Kawamata log terminal at some point $Q\in E$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big).\tag{1.7}$$

To complete the proof, we must consider the following possible cases:

- $Q\not\in\bar{\Delta}_1\cup\bar{\Delta}_2$,
- $Q=E\cap\bar{\Delta}_1$,
- $Q=E\cap\bar{\Delta}_2$.

Suppose that $Q\not\in\bar{\Delta}_1\cup\bar{\Delta}_2$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{S},\epsilon\bar{\mathcal{M}}+\big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+a_1+a_2-1\big)E\Big)$$

is not Kawamata log terminal at the point Q. Thus, we may assume that

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}$$

by induction. Thus, it follows from the inequality 1.7 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\geqslant\frac{4\big(1-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2},$$

which implies the required inequality if $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $a_2\leqslant 0$. Hence, it follows from the equality

$$\frac{4\big(1-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}=\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}-\frac{a_1a_2}{\epsilon^2}$$

that we may assume that $a_1>0$ and $a_2>0$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}>\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}+\big(a_1-a_2\big)^2,$$

because $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})<2-a_1-a_2$. This completes the proof in the case when $Q\not\in\bar{\Delta}_1\cup\bar{\Delta}_2$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $Q=E\cap\bar{\Delta}_1$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{S},\ \epsilon\bar{\mathcal{M}}+a_1\bar{\Delta}_1+\big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+a_1+a_2-1\big)E\Big)$$

is not Kawamata log terminal at the point Q. Thus, we may assume that

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\begin{cases}\dfrac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } a_1\geqslant 0 \text{ or } \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+a_1+a_2\geqslant 1,\\ \dfrac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } a_1\leqslant 0 \text{ and } \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1,\end{cases}$$

by induction. To complete the proof, we must consider the following possible cases:

- $a_2\geqslant 0$ and either $a_1\geqslant 0$ or $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\geqslant 1$,
- $a_2\geqslant 0$ and $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1$,
- $a_2\leqslant 0$ and either $a_1\geqslant 0$ or $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\geqslant 1$,
- $a_2\leqslant 0$ and $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1$.

Suppose that $a_2\geqslant 0$ and either $a_1\geqslant 0$ or $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\geqslant 1$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2},$$

and it follows from the inequality 1.7 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\geqslant\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}+\frac{4a_1^2}{\epsilon^2},$$

which completes the proof in the case when $a_2\geqslant 0$ and either $a_1\geqslant 0$ or $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\geqslant 1$.

Suppose that $a_2\geqslant 0$ and $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2},$$

and it follows from the inequality 1.7 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\geqslant\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}-\frac{4a_1\big(1+a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2},$$

which completes the proof in the case when $a_2\geqslant 0$ and $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1$.

Suppose that $a_2\leqslant 0$ and $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2},$$

and it follows from the inequality 1.7 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\frac{4\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\geqslant\frac{4\big(1-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}-\frac{4a_1}{\epsilon^2},$$

which completes the proof in the case when $a_2\leqslant 0$ and $a_1\leqslant 0$ and $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\leqslant 1$.

Thus, we may assume that $a_2\leqslant 0$ and either $a_1\geqslant 0$ or $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})+a_1+a_2\geqslant 1$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}.$$

and it follows from the inequality 1.7 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}^2_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)+\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(2-\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}\geqslant\frac{4-4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(a_1+a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}.$$

In the case when $a_1\geqslant 0$, we have

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4-4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(a_1+a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}=\frac{4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}+\frac{4a_1^2}{\epsilon^2},$$

which completes the proof. In the case when $a_1\leqslant 0$, we have

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4-4\big(1-a_1\big)\big(a_1+a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}=\frac{4\big(1-a_1-a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2}+\frac{4a_1\big(a_1+a_2\big)}{\epsilon^2},$$

which completes the proof. ☐

We prove the following analogue of Theorem 1.5 in Section 4.

Theorem 1.8. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a linear system on the surface S that does not have fixed components, and let ϵ be a positive rational number. Suppose that the log pair

$$\Big(S,\ \epsilon\mathcal{M}+a_1\Delta_1\Big)$$

is not terminal at the point O. Let M_1 and M_2 be general curves in $\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\begin{cases}\dfrac{1-2a_1}{\epsilon^2}\ \text{if}\ a_1\geqslant -1/2,\\ \dfrac{-4a_1}{\epsilon^2}\ \text{if}\ a_1\leqslant -1/2,\end{cases}\tag{1.9}$$

and if the inequality 1.9 is, actually, an equality, then $(S,\epsilon\mathcal{M}+a_1\Delta_1)$ is canonical and

- either $-a_1\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})=2/\epsilon$,
- or $a_1=0$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M})=1/\epsilon$.

We consider one application of Theorem 1.8 in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries

Let ϕ,ψ and $\upsilon_1,\ldots,\upsilon_\gamma$ be non-zero polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[z_1,\ldots,z_n]$ such that the locus

$$\upsilon_1=\cdots=\upsilon_\gamma=0\subset\mathbb{C}^n$$

has dimension at most $n-2$, let a,b and c be non-negative rational numbers. Put

$$\Omega=\frac{|\psi|^b}{|\phi|^a\Big(|\upsilon_1|+\cdots+|\upsilon_\gamma|\Big)^c},$$

and let $O\in\mathbb{C}^n$ be the origin.

Question 2.1. When Ω is square-integrable near the point O?

The answer to Question 2.1 is given in Example 2.8. By putting

$$c_0\big(\Omega\big)=\sup\Big\{\epsilon\in\mathbb{Q}\ \Big|\ \text{the function }\Omega^{2\epsilon}\text{ is locally integrable in near }O\in\mathbb{C}^n\Big\}\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geqslant 0}\cup\{+\infty\},$$

we see that Ω is locally integrable near the point $O\iff c_0(\Omega)>1$.

Example 2.2. Let $m_1,\ldots,m_n$ be positive integers. Then

$$\min\left(1,\ \sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{m_i}\right)=c_0\left(\frac{1}{|\sum_{i=1}^n z_i^{m_i}|}\right)\geqslant c_0\left(\frac{1}{|\prod_{i=1}^n z_i^{m_i}|}\right)=\min\left(\frac{1}{m_1},\frac{1}{m_2},\ldots,\frac{1}{m_n}\right).$$

Let X be a variety with rational singularities. Let us consider a formal linear combination

$$B_X=\sum_{i=1}^r a_iB_i+\sum_{i=1}^l c_i\mathcal{M}_i,$$

where a_i and c_i are rational numbers, B_i is a prime Weil divisor on X, and $\mathcal{M}_i$ is a linear system on the variety X that has no fixed components. We assume that $B_i\neq B_j$ and $\mathcal{M}_i\neq\mathcal{M}_j$ for $i\neq j$.

Remark 2.3. Let k be a big enough natural number. For every $i\in\{1,\ldots,l\}$ and $j\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$, let M_i^j be a sufficiently general element in the linear system $\mathcal{M}_i$. Then replacing every $\mathcal{M}_i$ by

$$\frac{M_i^1+M_i^2+M_i^3+M_i^4+\cdots+M_i^k}{k},$$

we can always consider B_X as a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety X.

Suppose that $K_X + B_X$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor.

Definition 2.4. We say that B_X is a boundary of the log pair (X, B_X). We say that

- B_X is mobile if $a_i = 0$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$,
- B_X is effective if $a_i \geqslant 0$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and $c_j \geqslant 0$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$.

Let $\pi \colon \bar{X} \to X$ be a birational morphism such that $\bar{X}$ is smooth. Put

$$B_{\bar{X}} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i \bar{B}_i + \sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i \bar{\mathcal{M}}_i,$$

where $\bar{B}_i$ is the proper transform of the divisor B_i on the variety $\bar{X}$, and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_i$ is the proper transform of the linear system $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_i$ on the variety $\bar{X}$. Then

$$K_{\bar{X}} + B_{\bar{X}} \equiv \pi^*\Big(K_X + B_X\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i E_i,$$

where $d_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, and E_i is an exceptional divisor of the morphism π. Suppose that

$$\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \bar{B}_i\right) \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} E_i\right)$$

is a divisor with simple normal crossing, and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_i$ is base point free for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$. Put

$$B^{\bar{X}} = B_{\bar{X}} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i E_i,$$

and take $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $1 \geqslant \epsilon \geqslant 0$. Then $(\bar{X}, B^{\bar{X}})$ is called the log pull back of (X, B_X).

Definition 2.5. The log pair (X, B_X) is ϵ-log canonical (respectively, ϵ-log terminal) if

- the inequality $a_i \leqslant 1 - \epsilon$ holds (respectively, the inequality $a_i < 1 - \epsilon$ holds),
- the inequality $d_j \geqslant -1 + \epsilon$ holds (respectively, the inequality $d_j > -1 + \epsilon$ holds),

for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

We say that (X, B_X) has log canonical singularities (respectively, log terminal singularities) if the log pair (X, B_X) is 0-log canonical (respectively, 0-log terminal).

Remark 2.6. Let P be a point in X, and let Δ be an effective divisor

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \epsilon_i B_i \equiv B_X,$$

where ϵ_i is a non-negative rational number. Suppose that

- the boundary B_X is effective,
- the divisor Δ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor,
- the log pair (X, Δ) is log canonical in the point $P \in X$,

but the log pair (X, B_X) is not log canonical in the point $P \in X$. Put

$$\alpha = \min\left\{ \frac{a_i}{\epsilon_i} \;\Big|\; \epsilon_i \neq 0 \right\},$$

where α is well defined, because there is $\epsilon_i \neq 0$. Then $\alpha < 1$, the log pair

$$\left(X,\ \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{a_i - \alpha\epsilon_i}{1 - \alpha} B_i + \sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i \mathcal{M}_i\right)$$

is not log canonical at the point $P \in X$, the equivalence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{a_i-\alpha\epsilon_i}{1-\alpha}B_i+\sum_{i=1}^{l}c_i\mathcal{M}_i\equiv B_X\equiv\Delta$$

holds, and at least one irreducible component of $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$ is not contained in

$$\mathrm{Supp}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{a_i-\alpha\epsilon_i}{1-\alpha}B_i\right).$$

Let D_X be another boundary on the variety X such that the divisor

$$K_X+B_X+D_X$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor. Let $Z\subseteq X$ be a closed subvariety.

Definition 2.7. The ϵ-log canonical threshold of the boundary D_X along Z is

$$\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{Z}\big(X,B_X,D_X\big)=\sup\Big\{\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}\ \Big|\ \text{the pair }\Big(X,B_X+\lambda D_X\Big)\text{ is }\epsilon\text{-log canonical along }Z\Big\}\in\mathbb{Q}\cup\big\{\pm\infty\big\}.$$

The role played by the number $\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{Z}(X,B_X,D_X)$ is very important for $\epsilon=0$. So we put

$$\mathrm{c}_{Z}\big(X,B_X,D_X\big)=\mathrm{c}^{0}_{Z}\big(X,B_X,D_X\big),$$

and we put $\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}(X,B_X,D_X)=\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{X}(X,B_X,D_X)$ and $\mathrm{c}(X,B_X,D_X)=\mathrm{c}^{0}_{X}(X,B_X,D_X)$. Note that

$$\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{Z}\big(X,B_X,D_X\big)=-\infty$$

if the log pair (X,B_X) is not ϵ-log canonical along Z and $D_X=0$. If $B_X=0$, then we put

$$\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{Z}\big(X,D_X\big)=\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{Z}\big(X,B_X,D_X\big),$$

and we put $\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}(X,D_X)=\mathrm{c}^{\epsilon}_{X}(X,D_X)$, $\mathrm{c}_{Z}(X,D_X)=\mathrm{c}_{Z}(X,B_X,D_X)$, $\mathrm{c}(X,D_X)=\mathrm{c}_{X}(X,D_X)$.

Example 2.8. It follows from [20] that

$$c_O\big(\Omega\big)=c_O\Big(\mathbb{C}^n,\ a\big(\psi=0\big)-b\big(\phi=0\big)+c\mathcal{B}\Big),$$

and the following conditions are equivalent:

- the function Ω is square-integrable near $O\in\mathbb{C}^n$,
- the singularities of the log pair

$$\left(\mathbb{C}^n,\ a\big(\phi=0\big)-b\big(\phi=0\big)+\frac{c}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\gamma}\lambda^{i}_{j}\upsilon_j=0\Big)\right)$$

  are log terminal near $O\in\mathbb{C}^n$, where $[\lambda^{i}_{1}:\cdots:\lambda^{i}_{\gamma}]$ is a general point in $\mathbb{P}^{\gamma-1}$, and k is a sufficiently big natural number,
- the singularities of the log pair

$$\Big(\mathbb{C}^n,\ a\big(\phi=0\big)-b\big(\phi=0\big)+c\mathcal{B}\Big)$$

  are log terminal near $O\in\mathbb{C}^n$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is a linear system generated by $\upsilon_1=0,\ldots,\upsilon_r=0$.

We say that the log pair (X,B_X) has canonical singularities (respectively, terminal singularities) if the log pair (X,B_X) is 1-log canonical (respectively, 1-log terminal).

Remark 2.9. Suppose that B_X is effective and (X,B_X) is canonical. Then $a_1=\cdots=a_r=0$.

One can show that Definition 2.5 is independent on the choice of π. Put

$$\mathrm{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big)=\left(\bigcup_{a_i\geqslant 1-\epsilon} B_i\right)\bigcup\left(\bigcup_{d_i\leqslant -1+\epsilon}\pi\big(E_i\big)\right)\subsetneq X,$$

put $\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X)=\mathrm{LCS}_0(X, B_X)$ and $\mathrm{CS}(X, B_X)=\mathrm{LCS}_1(X, B_X)$. We say that the subsets

$$\mathrm{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big),\ \mathrm{LCS}\Big(X, B_X\Big),\ \mathrm{CS}\Big(X, B_X\Big)$$

are the loci of ϵ-log canonical, log canonical, canonical singularities of (X, B_X), respectively.

Definition 2.10. A proper irreducible subvariety $Y\subsetneq X$ is said to be a center of ϵ-log canonical singularities of the log pair (X, B_X) if for some choice of the resolution $\pi\colon \bar{X}\to X$, one has

- either the inequality $a_i\geqslant 1-\epsilon$ holds and $Y=B_i$ for some $i\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$,
- or the inequality $d_i\leqslant -1+\epsilon$ holds and $Y=\pi(E_i)$ for some $i\in\{1,\ldots,m\}$.

Let $\mathbb{LCS}_{\epsilon}(X, B_X)$ be the set of all centers of ϵ-log canonical singularities of (X, B_X). Then

$$Y\in\mathbb{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big)\Longrightarrow Y\subseteq\mathrm{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big)$$

and $\mathbb{LCS}_{\epsilon}(X, B_X)=\varnothing\iff\mathrm{LCS}_{\epsilon}(X, B_X)=\varnothing\iff$ the log pair (X, B_X) is ϵ-log terminal.

Remark 2.11. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear system on X that has no base points, let H be a sufficiently general divisor in the linear system $\mathcal{H}$, and let $Y\subsetneq X$ be an irreducible subvariety. Put

$$Y\cap H=\sum_{i=1}^{k} Z_i,$$

where $Z_i\subset H$ is an irreducible subvariety. It follows from Definition 2.10 (cf. Theorem 2.17) that

$$Y\in\mathbb{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big)\iff\Big\{Z_1,\ldots,Z_k\Big\}\subseteq\mathbb{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(H, B_X\Big|_H\Big).$$

We put $\mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)=\mathbb{LCS}_0(X, B_X)$ and $\mathbb{CS}(X, B_X)=\mathbb{LCS}_1(X, B_X)$. We say that

- elements in $\mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)$ are centers of log canonical singularities of the log pair (X, B_X),
- elements in $\mathbb{CS}(X, B_X)$ are centers of canonical singularities of the log pair (X, B_X).

Example 2.12. Let $\chi\colon\hat{X}\to X$ be a blow up of a smooth point $P\in X$. Put

$$B_{\hat{X}}=\sum_{i=1}^{r}a_i\hat{B}_i+\sum_{i=1}^{l}c_i\hat{\mathcal{M}}_i,$$

where $\hat{B}_i$ is a proper transform of the divisor B_i on the variety $\hat{X}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_i$ is a proper transform of the linear system $\mathcal{M}_i$ on the variety $\hat{X}$. Then

$$K_{\hat{X}}+B_{\hat{X}}\equiv\pi^{*}\Big(K_X+B_X\Big)+\Big(\mathrm{dim}(X)-1-\mathrm{mult}_P\big(B_X\big)\Big)E,$$

where E is the exceptional divisor of χ, and $\mathrm{mult}_P(B_X)\in\mathbb{Q}$. Then

- the log pair (X, B_X) is ϵ-log canonical near $P\in X\iff$ the log pair

  $$\Big(\hat{X},\ B_{\hat{X}}+\Big(\mathrm{mult}_P\big(B_X\big)-\mathrm{dim}\big(X\big)+1\Big)E\Big)$$

  is ϵ-log canonical in a neighborhood of E, which implies that

  $$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(B_X\big)\geqslant\mathrm{dim}(X)-\epsilon\Longrightarrow P\in\mathbb{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big),$$

- if the boundary B_X is effective, then

  $$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(B_X\big)<1-\epsilon\Longrightarrow P\not\in\mathrm{LCS}_{\epsilon}\Big(X, B_X\Big),$$

- if the boundary B_X is effective and mobile, then

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(B_X\big) < 1 \Longrightarrow P \not\in \mathrm{CS}\Big(X, B_X\Big),$$

- if $\dim(X) = 2$, and the boundary B_X is effective, then

$$P \in \mathbb{CS}\Big(X, B_X\Big) \iff \mathrm{mult}_P\big(B_X\big) \geqslant 1.$$

If the boundary B_X is effective, then the locus $\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X) \subset X$ can be naturally equipped with a subscheme structure (see [29]). Indeed, if B_X is effective, jut put

$$\mathcal{I}\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \pi_*\Bigg(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lceil d_i\rceil E_i - \sum_{i=1}^{r}\lfloor a_i\rfloor \bar{B}_i\Bigg),$$

and let $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ be a subscheme that corresponds to the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}(X, B_X)$.

Definition 2.13. If the boundary B_X is effective, then we say that

- the subscheme $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ is the subscheme of log canonical singularities of (X, B_X),
- the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}(X, B_X)$ is the multiplier ideal sheaf of the log pair (X, B_X).

If the boundary B_X is effective, then it follows from the construction of $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ that

$$\mathrm{Supp}\Big(\mathcal{L}\big(X, B_X\big)\Big) = \mathrm{LCS}\Big(X, B_X\Big) \subset X.$$

The following result is the Nadel–Shokurov vanishing theorem (see [29]).

Theorem 2.14. Let H be a nef and big $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X such that

$$K_X + B_X + H \equiv D$$

for some Cartier divisor D on the variety X. Suppose that B_X is effective. Then for $i \geqslant 1$

$$H^i\Big(X,\ \mathcal{I}\big(X, B_X\big) \otimes D\Big) = 0.$$

Proof. See [23, Theorem 9.4.8]. □

Corollary 2.15. Suppose that B_X is effective. Then the locus

$$\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X, B_X\Big) \subset X$$

is connected if the divisor $-(K_X + B_X)$ is nef and big.

The assertion of Corollary 2.15 is a special case of the following result.

Theorem 2.16. Let $\psi\colon X \to Z$ be a morphism. Then the set

$$\mathrm{LCS}\Big(\bar{X},\ B^{\bar{X}}\Big)$$

is connected in a neighborhood of every fiber of the morphism $\psi \circ \pi\colon \bar{X} \to Z$ in the case when

- the boundary B_X is effective,
- the morphism ψ is surjective and has connected fibers,
- the divisor $-(K_X + B_X)$ is nef and big with respect to ψ.

Proof. See [29, Lemma 5.7]. □

Applying Theorem 2.16, one can prove the following result.

Theorem 2.17. Suppose that the boundary B_X is effective, the divisor K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, $a_1 = 1$, and B_1 is a Cartier divisor with log terminal singularities. Then the following are equivalent:

- the log pair (X, B_X) is log canonical in a neighborhood of the divisor B_1,

- the singularities of the log pair
$$\Bigg(B_1,\ \sum_{i=2}^{r}a_iB_i\Big\vert_{B_1}\Bigg)$$
are log canonical.

Proof. See [20, Theorem 7.5]. □

The simplest application of Theorem 2.17 is already a non-obvious result.

Lemma 2.18. Suppose that $\mathrm{dim}(X)=2$ and $a_1\leqslant 1$. Then
$$\Bigg(\sum_{i=2}^{r}a_iB_i\Bigg)\cdot B_1>1$$
whenever (X, B_X) is not log canonical in a point $P\in B_1$ such that $P\not\in\mathrm{Sing}(X)\cup\mathrm{Sing}(B_1)$.

Proof. Suppose that (X, B_X) is not log canonical in a point $P\in B_1$. By Theorem 2.17, we have
$$\Bigg(\sum_{i=2}^{r}a_iB_i\Bigg)\cdot B_1\geqslant\mathrm{mult}_P\Bigg(\sum_{i=2}^{r}a_iB_i\Big\vert_{B_1}\Bigg)>1$$
if $P\not\in\mathrm{Sing}(X)\cup\mathrm{Sing}(B_1)$, because $(X, B_1+\sum_{i=2}^{r}a_iB_i)$ is not log canonical at the point P. □

The assertion of Theorem 2.17 can be slightly refined.

Definition 2.19. The log pair (X, B_X) has purely log terminal singularities if

- the inequality $a_i\leqslant 1$ holds for every $i\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$,
- the inequality $d_j>-1$ for every $j\in\{1,\ldots,m\}$.

Theorem 2.20. Suppose that B_X is effective, $a_1=1$, and B_1 is a Cartier divisor. Then

- the variety B_1 has log terminal singularities if (X, B_X) is purely log terminal,
- the following assertions are equivalent:
  - the log pair (X, B_X) is purely log terminal in a neighborhood of the divisor B_1,
  - the variety B_1 has rational singularities, and the log pair
$$\Bigg(B_1,\ \sum_{i=2}^{r}a_iB_i\Big\vert_{B_1}\Bigg)$$
is log terminal.

Proof. See [20, Theorem 7.5]. □

Suppose now that the boundary B_X is effective and mobile. Thus, we have
$$B_X=\sum_{i=1}^{l}c_i\mathcal{M}_i,$$
where $c_i\in\mathbb{Q}$ and $c_i\geqslant 0$, and $\mathcal{M}_i$ is a linear system on X that has no fixed components.

Definition 2.21. We say that a log pair (Y, B_Y) is birationally equivalent to (X, B_X) and if

- the boundary B_Y is effective and mobile,
- there is a birational map $\xi\colon X\dashrightarrow Y$ such that
$$B_Y=\sum_{i=1}^{l}c_i\xi\big(\mathcal{M}_i\big),$$
where $\xi(\mathcal{M}_i)$ is a proper transform of the linear system $\mathcal{M}_i$ on the variety Y.

Thus, the log pairs $(\bar{X}, B_{\bar{X}})$ and (X, B_X) are birationally equivalent.

Definition 2.22. Let D be a Weil $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. Then D is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective if

$$\exists\ n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \big|nmD\big| \neq \varnothing,$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that mD is an integral Weil divisor.

Definition 2.23. The Kodaira dimension of the log pair (X, B_X) is the number

$$\kappa\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \begin{cases} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\bigg(\dim\Big(\phi_{|nm(K_{\bar{X}}+B_{\bar{X}})|}(X)\Big)\bigg) \text{ if } K_{\bar{X}} + B_{\bar{X}} \text{ is } \mathbb{Q}\text{-effective},\\ -\infty \text{ if } K_{\bar{X}} + B_{\bar{X}} \text{ is not } \mathbb{Q}\text{-effective}, \end{cases}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m(K_{\bar{X}} + B_{\bar{X}})$ is a Cartier divisor.

The number $\kappa(X, B_X)$ is independent on the choice of π (see [4, Lemma 1.3.6]).

Lemma 2.24. Let (Y, B_Y) be a log pair that is birationally equivalent to (X, B_X). Then

$$\kappa\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \kappa\Big(Y, B_Y\Big).$$

Proof. See [4, Lemma 1.3.6]. □

If the log pair (X, B_X) is canonical, then it follows from [4, Lemma 1.3.6] that

$$\kappa\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \begin{cases} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\bigg(\dim\Big(\phi_{|nm(K_X+B_X)|}(X)\Big)\bigg) \text{ if } K_X + B_X \text{ is } \mathbb{Q}\text{-effective},\\ -\infty \text{ if } K_X + B_X \text{ is } \mathbb{Q}\text{-effective}, \end{cases}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m(K_X + B_X)$ is a Cartier divisor.

Corollary 2.25. If (X, B_X) is canonical and $K_X + B_X$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective, then $\kappa(X, B_X) \geqslant 0$.

It follows from Definition 2.23 that

$$\kappa\Bigg(X,\ \sum_{i=1}^{l} c'_i \mathcal{M}_i\Bigg) \geqslant \kappa\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \kappa\Bigg(X,\ \sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i \mathcal{M}_i\Bigg)$$

in the case when $c'_i \geqslant c_i$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$

Definition 2.26. The log pair (X, B_X) is a canonical model if

- the divisor $K_X + B_X$ is ample,
- the log pair (X, B_X) has canonical singularities.

It follows from Definition 2.23 that $\kappa(X, B_X) = \dim(X)$ if (X, B_X) is canonical model.

Definition 2.27. A log pair (Y, B_Y) is a canonical model of the log pair (X, B_X) if

- the log pair (Y, B_Y) is a canonical model,
- the log pairs (Y, B_Y) and (X, B_X) are birationally equivalent.

The log pair (X, B_X) does not have a canonical model if $\kappa(X, B_X) < \dim(X)$.

Theorem 2.28. A canonical model is unique whenever it exists.

Proof. See [4, Theorem 1.3.20]. □

It follows from [2] that the following conditions are equivalent:

- the log pair (X, B_X) has canonical model,
- the equality $\kappa(X, B_X) = \dim(X)$ holds.

3. Inequality I

Let X be a surface, let O be a smooth point of X, let Δ_1 and Δ_2 be curves on X such that

$$O \in \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2,$$

both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are irreducible and reduced, both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are smooth at O, and Δ_1 intersects the curve Δ_2 transversally at O, let D be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the surface X such that

$$\Delta_1 \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}\big(D\big) \not\supseteq \Delta_2,$$

and let a_1 and a_2 be non-negative rational numbers. Suppose that the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ D + a_1\Delta_1 + a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not log canonical at O. Let $A, B, M, N, \alpha, \beta$ be non-negative rational numbers such that

- the inequality $\alpha a_1 + \beta a_2 \leqslant 1$ holds,
- the inequalities $A(B-1) \geqslant 1 \geqslant \max(M, N)$ hold,
- the inequalities $\alpha(A+M-1) \geqslant A^2(B+D-1)\beta$ and $\alpha(1-M) + A\beta \geqslant A$ holds,
- either the inequality $2M + AN \leqslant 2$ holds or

$$\alpha\big(B+1-MB-N\big) + \beta\big(A+1-AN-M\big) \geqslant AB-1.$$

Lemma 3.1. The inequalities $A + M \geqslant 1$ and $B > 1$ holds. The inequality

$$\alpha\big(B+1-MB-N\big) + \beta\big(A+1-AN-M\big) \geqslant AB-1$$

holds. The inequality $\beta(1-N) + B\alpha \geqslant B$ holds. The inequalities

$$\frac{\alpha(2-M)}{A+1} + \frac{\beta(2-N)}{B+1} \geqslant 1$$

and $\alpha(2-M)B + \beta(1-N)(A+1) \geqslant B(A+1)$ hold.

Proof. The inequality $B > 1$ follows from the inequality $A(B-1) \geqslant 1$. Then

$$\frac{\alpha}{A+1} + \frac{\beta}{B+1} \geqslant \frac{\alpha}{A+1} + \frac{\beta}{2B} \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$$

because $2B \geqslant B+1$. Similarly, we see that $A + M \geqslant 1$, because

$$\frac{\alpha(A+M-1)}{A^2(B+D-1)} \geqslant \beta \geqslant 0$$

and $B + D - 1 \geqslant 0$. The inequality $\beta(1-N) + B\alpha \geqslant B$ follows from the inequalities

$$\alpha + \frac{\beta(1-N)}{B} \geqslant \frac{2-M}{A+1}\alpha + \frac{\beta(1-N)}{B} \geqslant 1,$$

because $A + 1 \geqslant 2 - M$.

Let us show that the inequality

$$\alpha\big(2-M\big)B + \beta\big(1-N\big)\big(A+1\big) \geqslant B\big(A+1\big)$$

holds. Let L_1 be the line in $\mathbb{R}^2$ given by the equation

$$x\big(2-M\big)B + y\big(1-N\big)(A+1) - B(A+1) = 0$$

and let L_2 be the line that is given by the equation

$$x\big(1-N\big) + Ay - A = 0,$$

where (x, y) are coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then L_1 intersects the line $y = 0$ in a point

$$\left(\frac{A+1}{2-M}, 0\right)$$

and L_2 intersects the line $y = 0$ in a point $(A/(1-M), 0)$. But

$$\frac{A+1}{2-M} < \frac{A}{1-M},$$

which implies that $\alpha(2-M)B + \beta(1-N)(A+1) \geqslant B(A+1)$ if and only if

$$A^2\beta_0\big(B+N-1\big) \geqslant \alpha_0\big(A+M-1\big),$$

where (α_0, β_0) is the intersection point of the lines L_1 and L_2. But

$$\big(\alpha_0, \beta_0\big) = \left(\frac{A(A+1)(B+N-1)}{\Delta}, \frac{B(A-1+M)}{\Delta}\right),$$

where $\Delta = 2AB - ABM - A + AM - 1 + M + NA - NAM + N - NM$. But

$$A^2\Big(B\big(A-1+M\big)\Big)\big(B+N-1\big) \geqslant \Big(A\big(A+1\big)\big(B+N-1\big)\Big)\big(A+M-1\big),$$

because $A(B-1) \geqslant 1$, which implies that $A^2\beta_0(B+N-1) \geqslant \alpha_0(A+M-1)$.

Finally, let us show that that the inequality

$$\alpha\big(B+1-MB-N\big) + \beta\big(A+1-AN-M\big) \geqslant AB-1$$

holds. Let L_1' be the line in $\mathbb{R}^2$ given by the equation

$$x\big(B+1-MB-N\big) + y\beta\big(A+1-AN-M\big) - AB + 1 = 0$$

and let L_2 be the line that is given by the equation

$$x\big(1-N\big) + Ay - A = 0,$$

where (x, y) are coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then L_1' intersects the line $y = 0$ in a point

$$\left(\frac{AB-1}{B+1-MB-N}, 0\right)$$

and L_2 intersects the line $y = 0$ in a point $(A/(1-M), 0)$. But

$$\frac{AB-1}{B+1-MB-N} < \frac{A}{1-M},$$

which implies that $\alpha(B+1-MB-N) + \beta(A+1-AN-M) \geqslant AB-1$ if and only if

$$A^2\beta_1\big(B+N-1\big) \geqslant \alpha_1\big(A+M-1\big),$$

where (α_1, β_1) is the intersection point of the lines L_1' and L_2. Note that

$$\big(\alpha_1, \beta_1\big) = \left(\frac{A(AB-A-2+NA+M)}{\Delta'}, \frac{A+1-NA-M}{\Delta'}\right),$$

where $\Delta' = AB - 1 - ABM + AM + 2M - NAM - M^2$.

To complete the proof, we must show that the inequality

$$A^2\Big(A+1-NA-M\Big)(B+N-1) \geqslant \Big(A(AB-A-2+NA+M)\Big)(A+M-1)$$

holds. This inequality is equivalent to the inequality

$$\big(2-M\big)\big(A+M-1\big) \geqslant A\big(AN+2M-2)\big(B+N-1\big),$$

which is true, because $M \leqslant 1$ and $AN + 2M - 2 \leqslant 0$. □

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. Suppose that the inequalities

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_1\Big) \leqslant M + Aa_1 - a_2 \text{ and } \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_2\Big) \leqslant N + Ba_2 - a_1$$

hold. Let us show that this assumptions lead to a contradiction.

Lemma 3.2. The inequalities $a_1 > (1-M)/A$ and $a_2 > (1-N)/B$ hold.

Proof. If $a_1 > 1$, then $a_1 > (1-M)/A$ by Lemma 3.1. Suppose that $a_1 \leqslant 1$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ D+\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point O. Then it follows from Lemma 2.18 that

$$M+Aa_1-a_2 \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_1\Big) > 1-a_2,$$

which implies that $a_1 > (1-M)/A$. Similarly, we see that $a_2 > (1-N)/B$. □

Lemma 3.3. The inequalities $a_1 < 1$ and $a_2 < 1$ hold.

Proof. The inequalities $a_1 > (1-M)/A$ and $a_2 > (1-N)/B$ hold by Lemma 3.2. But

$$\alpha a_1+\beta a_2 \leqslant 1,$$

which implies that $a_1\alpha < 1-\beta(1-N)/B$ and $a_2\beta < 1-\alpha(1-M)/A$. Then

$$a_1 < 1 > a_2,$$

because $\beta(1-N)+B\alpha \geqslant B$ by Lemma 3.1 and $\alpha(1-M)+A\beta \geqslant A$ by assumption. □

Put $m_0=\mathrm{mult}_O(D)$. Then m_0 is a positive rational number.

Lemma 3.4. The inequalities $m_0 \leqslant M+Aa_1-a_2$ and $m_0 \leqslant N+Ba_2-a_1$ hold.

Proof. We have

$$m_0 \leqslant \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D\cdot\Delta_1\Big) \leqslant M+Aa_1-a_2,$$

which implies that $m_0 \leqslant M+Aa_1-a_2$. Similarly, we see that $m_0 \leqslant N+Ba_2-a_1$. □

Lemma 3.5. The inequality $m_0+a_1+a_2 \leqslant 2$ holds.

Proof. We know that $m_0+a_1+a_2 \leqslant M+(A+1)a_1$ and $m_0+a_1+a_2 \leqslant N+(B+1)a_2$. Then

$$\big(m_0+a_1+a_2\big)\Bigg(\frac{\alpha}{A+1}+\frac{\beta}{B+1}\Bigg) \leqslant \alpha a_1+\beta a_2+\frac{\alpha M}{A+1}+\frac{\beta N}{B+1} \leqslant 1+\frac{\alpha M}{A+1}+\frac{\beta N}{B+1},$$

which implies that $m_0+a_1+a_2 \leqslant 2$, because

$$\frac{\alpha(2-M)}{A+1}+\frac{\beta(2-N)}{B+1} \geqslant 1$$

by Lemma 3.1. □

Let $\pi_1\colon X_1 \to X$ be the blow up of the point O, and let F_1 be the π_1-exceptional curve. Then

$$K_{X_1}+D^1+a_1\Delta_1^1+a_2\Delta_2^1+\big(m_0+a_1+a_2-1\big)F_1 \equiv \pi_1^*\Big(K_X+D+a_1\Delta_1+a_2\Delta_2\Big),$$

where D^1, Δ_1^1, Δ_2^1 are proper transforms of D, Δ_1, Δ_2 on the surface X_1, respectively. The pair

$$\Big(X_1,\ D^1+a_1\Delta_1^1+a_2\Delta_2^1+\big(m_0+a_1+a_2-1\big)F_1\Big)$$

is not log canonical at some point $O_1 \in F_1$. Note that $m_0+a_1+a_2-1 \geqslant 0$.

Lemma 3.6. Either $O_1=F_1\cap\Delta_1^1$ or $O_1=F_1\cap\Delta_2^1$.

Proof. Suppose that $O_1 \notin \Delta_1^1 \cup \Delta_2^1$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(X_1,\ D^1 + \big(m_0 + a_1 + a_2 - 1\big)F_1\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point O_1. Then

$$m_0 = D^1 \cdot F_1 > 1$$

by Lemma 2.18, because $m_0 + a_1 + a_2 \leqslant 2$ by Lemma 3.5. Then

$$m_0\left(\frac{\beta + B\alpha}{AB-1} + \frac{\alpha + A\beta}{AB-1}\right) \leqslant \big(M + Aa_1 - a_2\big)\frac{\beta + B\alpha}{AB-1} + \big(N + Ba_2 - a_1\big)\frac{\alpha + A\beta}{AB-1},$$

because $m_0 \leqslant M + Aa_1 - a_2$ and $m_0 \leqslant N + Ba_2 - a_1$. On the other hand, we have

$$\big(M + Aa_1 - a_2\big)\frac{\beta + B\alpha}{AB-1} + \big(N + Ba_2 - a_1\big)\frac{\alpha + A\beta}{AB-1} \leqslant 1 + \frac{M\beta + MB\alpha + N\alpha + AN\beta}{AB-1},$$

because $\alpha a_1 + \beta a_2 \leqslant 1$ and $AB - 1 > 0$. But we already proved that $m_0 > 1$. Thus, we see that

$$\beta + B\alpha + \alpha + A\beta \leqslant AB - 1 + M\beta + MB\alpha + N\alpha + AN\beta,$$

which is impossible by Lemma 3.1. ☐

Lemma 3.7. The inequality $O_1 \neq F_1 \cap \Delta_1^1$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $O_1 \neq F_1 \cap \Delta_1^1$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(X_1,\ D^1 + a_1\Delta_1^1 + \big(m_0 + a_1 + a_2 - 1\big)F_1\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point O_1. Then

$$M + Aa_1 - a_2 - m_0 = D^1 \cdot \Delta_1^1 > 1 - \big(m_0 + a_1 + a_2 - 1\big)$$

by Lemma 2.18, because $a_1 < 1$ by Lemma 3.3. We have $a_1 > (2 - M)/(A + 1)$. Then

$$\frac{2 - M\alpha}{A+1} + \frac{\beta(1-N)}{B} < \alpha a_1 + \beta a_2 \leqslant 1,$$

because $a_2 > (1 - N)/B$ by Lemma 3.3. Thus, we see that

$$\frac{2 - M\alpha}{A+1} + \frac{\beta(1-N)}{B} < 1,$$

which is impossible by Lemma 3.1. ☐

Therefore, we see that $O_1 = F_1 \cap \Delta_2^1$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(X_1,\ D^1 + a_1\Delta_1^1 + a_2\Delta_2^1 + \big(m_0 + a_1 + a_2 - 1\big)F_1\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point O_1. We know that $1 \geqslant m_0 + a_1 + a_2 - 1 \geqslant 0$.

We have a blow up $\pi_1\colon X_1 \to X$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider a sequence of blow ups

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_n \arrow[r, "\pi_n"] & X_{n-1} \arrow[r, "\pi_{n-1}"] & \cdots \arrow[r, "\pi_3"] & X_2 \arrow[r, "\pi_2"] & X_1 \arrow[r, "\pi_1"] & X \end{tikzcd}$$

such that $\pi_{i+1}\colon X_{i+1} \to X_i$ is a blow up of the point $F_i \cap \Delta_2^i$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, where

- we denote by F_i the exceptional curve of the morphism π_i,
- we denote by Δ_2^i the proper transform of the curve Δ_2 on the surface X_i.

For every $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let D^k, Δ_1^k and F_i^k be the proper transforms on the surface X_k of the divisors D, Δ_1 and F_i, respectively. Then

$$K_{X_n} + D^n + a_1\Delta_1^n + a_2\Delta_2^n + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(a_1 + ja_2 - j + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j\right)F_i \equiv \pi^*\Big(K_X + D + a_1\Delta_1 + a_2\Delta_2\Big),$$

where $\pi = \pi_n \circ \cdots \circ \pi_2 \circ \pi_1$ and $m_i = \mathrm{mult}_{O_i}(D^i)$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then the log pair

$$\left(X_n,\ D^n + a_1\Delta_1^n + a_2\Delta_2^n + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(a_1 + ia_2 - i + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} m_j\right)F_i^n\right) \tag{3.8}$$

is not log canonical at some point of the set $F_1^n \cup F_2^n \cup \cdots \cup F_n^n$.

For every $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let us put $O_k = F_k \cap \Delta_2^k$

Lemma 3.9. For every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the inequalities

$$1 \geqslant a_1 + ia_2 - i + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} m_j \geqslant 0$$

hold, the log pair 3.8 is log canonical at every point of the set $(F_1^n \cup F_2^n \cup \cdots \cup F_n^n) \setminus O_n$.

It follows from Lemma 3.9 that there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j > 1,$$

which contradicts Lemma 3.9. Therefore, to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, it is enough to prove Lemma 3.9. Let us prove Lemma 3.9 by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The case $n = 1$ is done.

By induction, we may assume that $n \geqslant 2$. For every $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, we may assume that

$$1 \geqslant a_1 + ka_2 - k + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} m_j \geqslant 0,$$

the singularities of the log pair

$$\left(X_k,\ D^k + a_1\Delta_1^k + a_2\Delta_2^k + \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(a_1 + ka_2 - k + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} m_j\right)F_i^k\right)$$

are log canonical at every point of the set $(F_1^k \cup F_2^k \cup \cdots \cup F_k^k) \setminus O_k$ and not log canonical at O_k.

Lemma 3.10. The following inequality holds:

$$a_2 > \frac{n - N}{B + n - 1}.$$

Proof. The singularities of the log pair

$$\left(X_{n-1},\ D^{n-1} + a_2\Delta_2^k + \left(a_1 + \big(n-1\big)a_2 - \big(n-1\big) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} m_j\right)F_{n-1}^n\right)$$

are not log canonical at the point O_{n-1}. Then

$$N - Ba_2 - a_1 - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} m_j = D^{n-1} \cdot \Delta_2^{n-1} > 1 - \left(a_1 + \big(n-1\big)a_2 - \big(n-1\big) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} m_j\right)$$

by Lemma 2.18, because $a_2 < 1$ by Lemma 3.3. We have

$$a_2 > \frac{n - N}{B + n - 1},$$

which completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 3.11. The inequalities $1 \geqslant a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j \geqslant 0$ hold.

Proof. The inequality $a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j \geqslant 0$ follows from the fact that the log pair

$$\left(X_{n-1},\ D^{n-1} + a_2\Delta_2^k + \left(a_1 + \big(n-1\big)a_2 - \big(n-1\big) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} m_j\right)F_{n-1}^n\right)$$

is not log canonical at the point O_{n-1}. Suppose that $a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j > 1$.

We have $m_0 + a_2 \leqslant M + Aa_1$ by Lemma 3.4. Then

$$a_1 + nM + nAa_1 - n \geqslant a_1 + na_2 - n + nm_0 \geqslant a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j > 1,$$

which immediately implies that the inequality

$$a_1 > \frac{n+1-Mn}{nA+1}$$

holds. On the other hand, we know that the inequality

$$a_2 > \frac{n-N}{B+n-1}$$

holds by Lemma 3.10. Therefore, we see that

$$\left(\frac{\alpha - M}{A} + \beta\right) + \alpha\frac{A-1+M}{A(An+1)} + \beta\frac{1-B-N}{B+n-1} = \alpha\frac{n+1-Mn}{nA+1} + \beta\frac{n-N}{B+n-1} < \alpha a_1 + \beta a_2 \leqslant 1,$$

where $\alpha(1-M)/A + \beta \geqslant 1$. Therefore, we see that

$$\alpha\frac{A+M-1}{A(An+1)} < \beta\frac{B+N-1}{B+n-1},$$

where $n \geqslant 2$. But $A + M > 1$ and $B > 1$ by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. Thus, we see that

$$\frac{A(An+1)}{\alpha(A+M-1)} > \frac{B+n-1}{\beta(B+N-1)},$$

but $A^2(B+N-1)\beta \leqslant \alpha(A+M-1)$ by assumption. Then

$$\frac{A}{\alpha(A+M-1)} - \frac{B-1}{\beta(B+N-1)} \geqslant \left(\frac{A^2}{\alpha(A+M-1)} - \frac{1}{\beta(B+M-1)}\right)n + \frac{A}{\alpha(A+M-1)} - \frac{B-1}{\beta(B+N-1)} > 0,$$

which implies that $\beta A(B+N-1) > \alpha(B-1)(A+M-1)$. Then

$$\frac{\alpha(A+M-1)}{A} \geqslant \beta A\big(B+N-1\big) > \alpha\big(B-1\big)\big(A+M-1\big),$$

because $A^2(B+N-1)\beta \leqslant \alpha(A+M-1)$ by assumption. Then $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$A\big(B-1\big) < 1,$$

which is impossible, because $A(B-1) \geqslant 1$ by assumption. ☐

Lemma 3.12. The log pair 3.8 is log canonical in every point of the set

$$F_n \setminus \left(\Big(F_n \cap F_{n-1}^n\Big) \bigcup \Big(F_n \cap \Delta_2^n\Big)\right).$$

Proof. Suppose that there is a point $Q \in F_n$ such that

$$F_n \cap F^n_{n-1} \neq Q \neq F_n \cap \Delta^n_2,$$

but the log pair 3.8 is not log canonical at Q. Then the log pair

$$\Bigg(X_n,\ D^n + \Bigg(a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j\Bigg) F_n\Bigg)$$

is not log canonical at the point Q as well. Then

$$m_0 \geqslant m_{n-1} = D^n \cdot F_n > 1$$

by Lemma 2.18, because $a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j \leqslant 1$ by Lemma 3.11. Then

$$m_0\Bigg(\frac{\beta + B\alpha}{AB - 1} + \frac{\alpha + A\beta}{AB - 1}\Bigg) \leqslant \big(M + Aa_1 - a_2\big)\frac{\beta + B\alpha}{AB - 1} + \big(N + Ba_2 - a_1\big)\frac{\alpha + A\beta}{AB - 1},$$

because $m_0 \leqslant M + Aa_1 - a_2$ and $m_0 \leqslant N + Ba_2 - a_1$ by Lemma 3.4. We have

$$\big(M + Aa_1 - a_2\big)\frac{\beta + B\alpha}{AB - 1} + \big(N + Ba_2 - a_1\big)\frac{\alpha + A\beta}{AB - 1} \leqslant 1 + \frac{M\beta + MB\alpha + N\alpha + AN\beta}{AB - 1},$$

because $\alpha a_1 + \beta a_2 \leqslant 1$ and $AB - 1 > 0$. But $m_0 > 1$. Thus, we see that

$$\beta + B\alpha + \alpha + A\beta \leqslant AB - 1 + M\beta + MB\alpha + N\alpha + AN\beta,$$

which contradicts our initial assumptions. □

Lemma 3.13. The log pair 3.8 is log canonical at the point $F_n \cap F^n_{n-1}$.

Proof. Suppose that the log pair 3.8 is not log canonical at $F_n \cap F^n_{n-1}$. Then the log pair

$$\Bigg(X_n,\ D^n + \Bigg(a_1 + \big(n-1\big)a_2 - \big(n-1\big) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} m_j\Bigg)F^n_{n-1} + \Bigg(a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j\Bigg)F_n\Bigg)$$

is not log canonical at the point $F_n \cap F^n_{n-1}$ as well. Then

$$m_{n-2} - m_{n-1} = D^n \cdot F_{n-2} > 1 - \Bigg(a_1 + na_2 - n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j\Bigg)$$

by Lemma 2.18, because $a_1 + (n-1)a_2 - (n-1) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} m_j$. Note that

$$M + Aa_1 - a_2 - m_0 \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(D \cdot \Delta_1\Big) - m_0 \geqslant D \cdot \Delta_1 - m_0 = D^1 \cdot \Delta^1_1 \geqslant 0,$$

which implies that $m_0 + a_2 \leqslant Aa_1 + M$. Then

$$nM + nAa_1 - na_2 \geqslant nm_0 \geqslant \big(n+1\big)m_0 - m_{n-1} \geqslant m_{n-2} - m_{n-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} m_j > n + 1 - a_1 - na_2,$$

which gives $a_1 > (n+1-nM)/(An+1)$. The proof of Lemma 3.11 implies a contradiction. □

The assertion of Lemma 3.9 is proved. The assertion of Theorem 1.3 is proved.

4. Inequality II

Let X be a surface, let O be a smooth point of X, let $\mathcal{M}$ be a linear system on X that does not have fixed components, let Δ_1 be an irreducible and reduced curve on X such that

$$O \in \Delta_1 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}\big(\Delta_1\big),$$

let ϵ and a_1 be rational numbers such that $\epsilon > 0$ and $a_1 \leqslant 0$. Suppose that the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ \epsilon\mathcal{M} + a_1\Delta_1\Big)$$

is not terminal at the point O. To prove Theorem 1.8, we must prove that

- the inequality 1.9 holds, which means
$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1 \cdot M_2\Big) \geqslant \begin{cases} \dfrac{1-2a_1}{\epsilon^2} \text{ if } a_1 \geqslant -1/2, \\ \dfrac{-4a_1}{\epsilon^2} \text{ if } a_1 \leqslant -1/2, \end{cases}$$
where M_1 and M_2 are general curves in $\mathcal{M}$,
- if the inequality 1.9 is, actually, an equality, then
  - either $-a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 2/\epsilon$,
  - or $a_1 = 0$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 1/\epsilon$.

There is a birational morphism $\pi\colon \bar{X} \to X$ such that

- the morphism π is a sequence of blow ups of smooth points,
- the morphism contracts m irreducible curves $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_m$ to the point O,
- the morphism π induces an isomorphism
$$\bar{X} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} E_i \cong X \setminus O,$$
- for some rational numbers $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m$, we have
$$K_{\bar{X}} + \epsilon\bar{\mathcal{M}} + a_1\bar{\Delta}_1 \equiv \pi^*\Big(K_X + \epsilon\mathcal{M} + a_1\Delta_1\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i E_i,$$
where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\bar{\Delta}_1$ are proper transforms of $\mathcal{M}$ and Δ_1 on the surface $\bar{X}$, respectively,
- the inequality $d_m \leqslant 0$ holds and
  - either the equality $m = 1$ holds,
  - or $m \geqslant 2$ and $d_i > 0$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$.

Lemma 4.1. Suppose that $a_1 \geqslant 0$. Then $m = 1$.

Proof. The required assertion is well-known and easy to prove. So we omit the proof. □

Let $\chi\colon \hat{X} \to X$ be a blow up of the point O, let E be the exceptional curve of χ. Then

$$K_{\hat{X}} + \epsilon\hat{\mathcal{M}} + a_1\hat{\Delta}_1 + \Big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + a_1 - 1\Big)E \equiv \pi^*\Big(K_X + \epsilon\mathcal{M} + a_1\Delta_1\Big),$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\hat{\Delta}_1$ are proper transforms of $\mathcal{M}$ and Δ_1 on the surface $\hat{X}$, respectively.

Lemma 4.2. Suppose that $m = 1$. Then

- the inequality 1.9 holds,
- if the inequality 1.9 is, actually, an equality, then
  - either $-a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 2/\epsilon$,
  - or $a_1 = 0$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 1/\epsilon$.

Proof. We have $\pi = \chi$ and $d_1 = 1 - \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) - a_1 \leqslant 0$. Hence, we have

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1 \cdot M_1\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_P^2\big(\mathcal{M}\big) \geqslant \frac{\big(1-a_1\big)^2}{\epsilon^2} \geqslant \max\left(\frac{1-2a_1}{\epsilon^2},\ \frac{-4a_1}{\epsilon^2}\right),$$

which implies the inequality 1.9. Moreover, if the inequality 1.9 is equality, then

- either $a_1 = -1$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 2/\epsilon$,
- or $a_1 = 0$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 1/\epsilon$,

which completes the proof. □

Let us prove Theorem 1.8 by induction on m. We may assume that $m \geqslant 2$. Then $a_1 < 0$ and

$$\left(\hat{X},\ a_1\hat{\Delta}_1 + \epsilon\hat{\mathcal{M}} + \Big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + a_1 - 1\Big)E\right)$$

is not terminal at some point $Q \in E$. Note that $d_1 = 1 - \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) - a_1$.

Let $\hat{M}_1$ and $\hat{M}_2$ be proper transforms of M_1 and M_2 on the surface $\hat{X}$, respectively. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1 \cdot M_2\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_P^2\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + \mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\hat{M}_1 \cdot \hat{M}_2\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) \geqslant 1/\epsilon$. But $d_1 = 1 - \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) - a_1 \leqslant 0$ and the log pair

$$\left(\hat{X},\ \epsilon\hat{\mathcal{M}} + \Big(\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + a_1 - 1\Big)E\right)$$

is not terminal at the point Q as well. By induction, we have

$$\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\hat{M}_1 \cdot \hat{M}_2\Big) \geqslant \begin{cases} \dfrac{3 - 2\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - 2a_1}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + a_1 \geqslant 1/2, \\ \dfrac{4 - 4\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - 4a_1}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + a_1 \leqslant 1/2, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

and if the inequality 4.3 is an equality, then

- either $-a_1 - \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathrm{mult}_Q(\hat{M}_1) = \mathrm{mult}_Q(\hat{M}_2) = 2/\epsilon$,
- or $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + a_1 = 1$ and $\mathrm{mult}_Q(\hat{M}_1) = \mathrm{mult}_Q(\hat{M}_2) = 1/\epsilon$.

Lemma 4.4. Suppose that $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + a_1 \leqslant 1/2$. Then

- the inequality 1.9 holds,
- if the inequality 1.9 is, actually, an equality, then
  - either $-a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 2/\epsilon$,
  - or $a_1 = 0$ and $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 1/\epsilon$.

Proof. Then $a_1 \leqslant 1/2 - \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) \leqslant -1/2$ and

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1 \cdot M_2\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_P^2\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + \frac{4 - 4\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - 4a_1}{\epsilon^2} = \frac{-4a_1}{\epsilon^2} + \left(\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)^2 \geqslant \frac{-4a_1}{\epsilon^2},$$

which implies the inequality 1.9. Moreover, if the inequality 1.9 is an equality, then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) = \frac{2}{\epsilon},$$

and the inequality 4.3 is an equality as well. By induction, we see that

$$-a_1 - 1 = -a_1 - \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + 1 \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies that $-a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Thus, to complete the proof of Theorem 1.8, we may assume that $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + a_1 \geqslant 1/2$.

Lemma 4.5. Suppose that $a_1 \geqslant -1/2$. Then

- the inequality 1.9 holds,
- the inequality 1.9 is not an equality.

Proof. It follows from $\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + a_1 \geqslant 1/2$ and $a_1 \geqslant -1/2$ that

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1 \cdot M_1\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{mult}^2_P\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + \frac{3 - 2\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - 2a_1}{\epsilon^2} \geqslant \frac{2 - 2a_1}{\epsilon^2},$$

which completes the proof. □

Thus, to complete the proof of Teorem 1.8, we may assume that $a_1 \leqslant -1/2$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(M_1 \cdot M_1\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{mult}^2_P\big(\mathcal{M}\big) + \frac{3 - 2\epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - 2a_1}{\epsilon^2} \geqslant \frac{9/4 - a_1 + a_1^2}{\epsilon^2} \geqslant \frac{-4a_1}{\epsilon^2},$$

because $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) \geqslant (1/2 - a_1)/\epsilon$, which implies the inequality 1.9.

Lemma 4.6. The inequality 1.9 is not an equality.

Proof. Suppose that the inequality 1.9 is an equality. Then $a_1 = -3/2$ and

$$\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big) = \frac{\big(1/2 - a_1\big)}{\epsilon},$$

which implies that $\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) = 2/\epsilon$. The inequality 4.3 must be an equality as well. Then

$$\frac{1}{2} = \epsilon\mathrm{mult}_O(\mathcal{M}) + a_1 = 1$$

by induction, which is a contradiction. □

Thus, the assertion of Theorem 1.8 is proved.

5. Orbifolds

Let X be a Fano variety with at most quotient singularities. The number

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) = \sup\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}\ \middle|\ \begin{array}{l}\text{the log pair } \Big(X, \lambda D\Big) \text{ is log canonical}\\ \text{for every effective } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisor } D \equiv -K_X\end{array}\right\}$$

is called the global log canonical threshold of the Fano variety X (cf. Definition A.23).

Theorem 5.1. The variety X admits an orbifold Kähler–Einstein metric if

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) > \frac{\dim(X)}{\dim(X) + 1}.$$

Proof. See [31], [12], [8, Appendix A]. □

The following result is proved in [22].

Theorem 5.2. Let X be a hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 2, 3)$ of degree 6. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) \geqslant \frac{5}{6}$$

if the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$ consists of Du Val singular points of type $\mathbb{A}_3$.

Proof. Suppose that the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$ consists of Du Val singular points of type $\mathbb{A}_3$. Put $\omega = 5/6$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X) < \omega$. Then there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on the surface X such that

$$D \equiv -K_X,$$

and the log pair $(X, \omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $P \in X$.

Let C be the curve in $|-K_X|$ such that $P \in C$. Then C is irreducible, and the log pair

$$\big(X, \omega C\big)$$

is log canonical. By Remark 2.6, we may assume that $C \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$.

The surface X must be singular at the point P, because otherwise we have

$$1 = K_X^2 = C \cdot D \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_P\big(D\big) > 1/\omega = \frac{6}{5} > 1.$$

Let $\pi\colon \tilde{X} \to X$ be a birational morphism such that

- the morphism π contracts three irreducible curves E_1, E_2, E_3 to the point $P \in X$,
- the morphism π induces an isomorphism
$$\bar{X} \setminus \Big(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3\Big) \cong X \setminus P,$$
- the surface $\bar{X}$ is smooth along the curves E_1, E_2, E_3.

We have $E_1^2 = E_2^2 = E_3^2 = -2$. We may assume that $E_1 \cdot E_3 = 0$ and $E_1 \cdot E_2 = E_2 \cdot E_3 = 1$.

Let $\bar{C}$ be the proper transform of the curve C on the surface $\bar{X}$. Then the equivalence

$$\bar{C} \equiv \pi^*\big(C\big) - E_1 - E_2 - E_3$$

holds. Let $\bar{D}$ be the proper transform of D on the surface $\bar{X}$. Then

$$\bar{D} \equiv \pi^*\big(D\big) - a_1 E_1 - a_2 E_2 - a_3 E_3,$$

where a_1, a_2 and a_3 are positive rational numbers. Then

$$\begin{cases} 1 - a_1 - a_3 = \bar{D} \cdot \bar{C} \geqslant 0, \\ 2a_1 - a_2 = \bar{D} \cdot E_1 \geqslant 0, \\ 2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 = \bar{D} \cdot E_2 \geqslant 0, \\ 2a_3 - a_2 = \bar{D} \cdot E_3 \geqslant 0, \end{cases}$$

which gives $1 \geqslant a_1 + a_3$, $2a_1 \geqslant a_2$, $3a_2 \geqslant 2a_3$, $2a_3 \geqslant a_2$, $3a_2 \geqslant 2a_1$, $a_1 \leqslant 3/4$, $a_2 \leqslant 1$, $a_3 \leqslant 3/4$.

It follows from the equivalence

$$K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{D} + a_1 E_1 + a_2 E_2 + a_3 E_3 \equiv \pi^*\Big(K_X + D\Big)$$

that there is a point $Q \in E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ such that the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{X},\ \bar{D} + a_1 E_1 + a_2 E_2 + a_3 E_3\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point Q, because (X, D) is not log canonical at $P \in X$.

Suppose that $Q \in E_1$ and $Q \notin E_2$. Then $(\bar{X}, \bar{D} + E_1)$ is not log canonical at Q. Then

$$2a_1 - a_2 = \bar{D} \cdot E_1 \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{D} \cdot E_1\Big) > 1$$

by Lemma 2.18. Therefore, we see that

$$1 \geqslant \frac{4}{3}a_1 \geqslant 2a_1 - \frac{2}{3}a_1 \geqslant 2a_1 - a_2 > 1,$$

which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $Q \in E_2$ and $Q \notin E_1 \cup E_3$. Then $(\bar{X}, \bar{D} + E_2)$ is not log canonical at Q. Then

$$2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 = \bar{D} \cdot E_2 \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{D} \cdot E_2\Big) > 1$$

by Lemma 2.18. Therefore, we see that

$$1 \geqslant a_2 = 2a_2 - \frac{a_2}{2} - \frac{a_2}{2} \geqslant 2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 > 1,$$

which is a contradiction.

We may assume that $Q = E_1 \cap E_2$. Then $(\bar{X}, \bar{D} + a_1E_1 + a_2E_2)$ is not log canonical at Q. But

$$a_1 + \frac{a_2}{2} \leqslant a_1 + a_3 \leqslant 1,$$

because $2a_3 \geqslant a_2$. Hence, we can apply Theorem 1.3 to the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{X},\ \bar{D} + a_1E_1 + a_2E_2\Big)$$

with $M = N = 0$, $A = 2$, $B = 3/2$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$. Thus, we have

$$2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 = \mathrm{mult}_O\Big(\bar{D} \cdot E_2\Big) > \frac{3}{2}a_2 - a_1,$$

because $\bar{D} \cdot E_1 = 2a_1 - a_2$. Then $a_2 > 2a_3$, which is a contradiction, because $2a_3 \geqslant a_2$. □

The following result is proved in [22].

Theorem 5.3. Let X be a singular hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(1,1,2,3)$ of degree 6. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) = \frac{4}{5}$$

if the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$ consists of Du Val singular points of type $\mathbb{A}_4$.

Proof. Suppose that the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$ consists of Du Val singular points of type $\mathbb{A}_4$.

Let P be a point of the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$, and let $\pi\colon \tilde{X} \to X$ be a birational morphism such that

- the morphism π contracts four irreducible curves E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4 to the point $P \in X$,
- the morphism π induces an isomorphism

$$\bar{X} \setminus \Big(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup E_4\Big) \cong X \setminus P,$$

- the surface $\bar{X}$ is smooth along the curves E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4.

We have $E_1^2 = E_2^2 = E_3^2 = E_4^2 = -2$. We may assume that

$$E_1 \cdot E_3 = E_1 \cdot E_4 = E_2 \cdot E_4 = 0,$$

and $E_1 \cdot E_2 = E_2 \cdot E_3 = E_3 \cdot E_4 = 1$.

There exists a unique smooth irreducible curve $\bar{Z} \subset \bar{X}$ such that

$$\pi\big(\bar{Z}\big) \sim -2K_X$$

and $E_2 \cap E_3 \in Z$. Put $\omega = 4/5$ and $Z = \pi(\bar{Z})$. Then

$$Z \sim \pi^*\Big(-2K_X\Big) - E_1 - 2E_2 - 2E_3 - E_4,$$

which implies that $(X, \omega Z)$ is log canonical and not log terminal. Then $\mathrm{lct}(X) \leqslant \omega$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X) < \omega$. Then there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on the surface X such that

$$D \equiv -K_X,$$

and the log pair $(X, \omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $O \in X$.

By Remark 2.6, we may assume that $Z \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$, because Z is irreducible.

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.2, we see that we may assume that $O = P$.

Let $\bar{D}$ be the proper transform of D on the surface $\bar{X}$. Then

$$\bar{D} \equiv \pi^*\big(D\big) - a_1E_1 - a_2E_2 - a_3E_3 - a_4E_4,$$

where a_1, a_2, a_3 and a_4 are positive rational numbers. Then it follows from the equivalence

$$K_{\bar{X}} + \bar{D} + a_1E_1 + a_2E_2 + a_3E_3 + a_4E_4 \equiv \pi^*\Big(K_X + D\Big),$$

that there is a point $Q \in E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup E_4$ such that the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{X},\ \bar{D} + a_1E_1 + a_2E_2 + a_3E_3 + a_4E_4\Big),$$

is not log canonical at the point Q, because (X, D) is not log canonical at $P \in X$.

Let C be the curve in $|-K_X|$ such that $P \in C$. Then C is irreducible, and the log pair

$$\big(X, \omega C\big)$$

is log canonical. By Remark 2.6, we may assume that $C \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$.

Let $\bar{C}$ be the proper transform of the curve C on the surface $\bar{X}$. Then the equivalence

$$\bar{C} \equiv \pi^*\big(C\big) - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 - E_4$$

holds. Note that $\bar{D} \cdot \bar{C} \geqslant 0$. Thus, we have

$$1 - a_1 - a_4 = \bar{D} \cdot \bar{C} \geqslant 0,$$

which implies that $a_1 + a_4 \leqslant 1$. Similarly, we see that

$$\begin{cases} 2a_1 - a_2 = \bar{D} \cdot E_1 \geqslant 0, \\ 2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 = \bar{D} \cdot E_2 \geqslant 0, \\ 2a_3 - a_2 - a4 = \bar{D} \cdot E_3 \geqslant 0, \\ 2a_4 - a_3 = \bar{D} \cdot E_4 \geqslant 0, \end{cases}$$

which implies that $a_1 \leqslant 4/5$, $a_2 \leqslant 6/5$, $a_3 \leqslant 6/5$ and $a_4 \leqslant 4/5$. Thus, we see that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(\bar{X},\ \bar{D} + a_1E_1 + a_2E_2 + a_3E_3 + a_4E_4\Big) = \big\{Q\big\},$$

by Theorem 2.16, because $\omega < 5/6$. Similarly, we see that

$$\frac{4}{5}a_1 + \frac{2}{5}a_2 = \omega a_1 + \frac{\omega a_2}{2} \leqslant 1.$$

Suppose that $Q \in E_1$ and $Q \notin E_2$. Then $(\bar{X}, \bar{D} + E_1)$ is not log canonical at Q. Then

$$2a_1 - a_2 = \bar{D} \cdot E_1 \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{D} \cdot E_1\Big) > 1$$

by Lemma 2.18. Therefore, we see that

$$1 \geqslant \frac{5}{4}a_1 \geqslant 2a_1 - \frac{3}{4}a_1 \geqslant 2a_1 - a_2 > 1,$$

which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $Q \in E_2$ and $Q \notin E_1 \cup E_3$. Then

$$2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 = \bar{D} \cdot E_2 \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{D} \cdot E_2\Big) > 1$$

by Lemma 2.18. Therefore, we see that

$$1 \geqslant \frac{5}{6}a_2 \geqslant 2a_2 - \frac{a_2}{2} - \frac{2}{3}a_2 \geqslant 2a_2 - a_1 - a_3 > 1,$$

which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $Q = E_1 \cap E_2$. Then we can apply Theorem 1.3 to the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{X},\ \omega\bar{D} + \omega a_1E_1 + \omega a_2E_2\Big)$$

with $M=N=0$, $A=2$, $B=3/2$, $\alpha=1$ and $\beta=1/2$. Thus, we have

$$2a_2-a_1-a_3=\mathrm{mult}_O\Big(\bar{D}\cdot E_2\Big)>\frac{3}{2}a_2-a_1,$$

because $\bar{D}\cdot E_1=2a_1-a_2$. Then $a_2>2a_3$, which easily leads to a contradiction.

To complete the proof, we may assume that $Q=E_2\cap E_3$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(\bar{X},\ \omega\bar{D}+\omega a_2E_2+\omega a_3E_3\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point Q. Then

$$2a_2-\frac{1}{2}a_2-a_3\geqslant 2a_2-a_1-a_3=\bar{D}\cdot E_2\geqslant\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{D}\cdot E_2\Big)>\frac{5}{4}-a_3,$$

by Lemma 2.18. Similarly, we see that

$$2a_3-a_2-a_4=\bar{D}\cdot E_3\geqslant\mathrm{mult}_Q\Big(\bar{D}\cdot E_3\Big)>\frac{5}{4}-a_2,$$

which implies that $a_2>5/6$ and $a_3>5/6$.

Let $\xi\colon\tilde{X}\to\bar{X}$ be a blow up of Q, let E be the exceptional curve of ξ, and let $\tilde{D}$ be the proper transform on the surface $\tilde{X}$ of the divisor $\bar{D}$. Put $m=\mathrm{mult}_Q(\bar{D})$. Then

$$\tilde{D}\equiv\xi^*\big(\bar{D}\big)-mE.$$

Let $\tilde{E}_1$, $\tilde{E}_2$, $\tilde{E}_3$, $\tilde{E}_4$ be the proper transforms on $\tilde{X}$ of E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4, respectively. Then

$$K_{\tilde{X}}+\omega\tilde{D}+\omega a_2\tilde{E}_2+\omega a_3\tilde{E}_3+\Big(\omega a_2+\omega a_3+\omega m-1\Big)E\equiv\xi^*\Big(K_{\bar{X}}+\omega\bar{D}+\omega a_2E_2+\omega a_3E_3\Big),$$

which implies that there is a point $R\in E$ such that the pair

$$\left(\tilde{X},\omega\tilde{D}+\omega a_2\tilde{E}_2+\omega a_3\tilde{E}_3+\Big(\omega a_2+\omega a_3+\omega\mathrm{mult}_Q\big(\bar{D}\big)-1\Big)E\right)$$

is not log canonical at the point R.

Let $\tilde{Z}$ be the proper transform on $\tilde{X}$ of the curve $\bar{Z}$. Then

$$0\leqslant\tilde{Z}\cdot\tilde{D}=2-a_2-a_3-\mathrm{mult}_Q\big(\bar{D}\big)=2-a_2-a_3-m,$$

which implies that $m+a_2+a_3\leqslant 2$. In particular, we see that the inequality

$$\omega a_2+\omega a_3+\omega m-1\leqslant 2\omega-1\leqslant\frac{3}{5}$$

holds. Thus, we see that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\left(\tilde{X},\omega\tilde{D}+\omega a_2\tilde{E}_2+\omega a_3\tilde{E}_3+\Big(\omega a_2+\omega a_3+\omega\mathrm{mult}_Q\big(\bar{D}\big)-1\Big)E\right)=\big\{R\big\}$$

by Theorem 2.16. Similarly, we see that

$$\begin{cases}2a_3-a_2-a_4-m=\tilde{E}_3\cdot\tilde{D}\geqslant 0,\\ 2a_2-a_1-a_3-m=\tilde{E}_2\cdot\tilde{D}\geqslant 0,\end{cases}$$

which implies that $E\cdot\tilde{D}=m\leqslant 1/2$.

Suppose that $Q\notin E_2\cup E_3$. Then the log pair

$$\left(\tilde{X},\omega\tilde{D}+\Big(\omega a_2+\omega a_3+\omega\mathrm{mult}_Q\big(\bar{D}\big)-1\Big)E\right)$$

is not log canonical at the point R. Then

$$\frac{5}{4}>\frac{1}{2}\geqslant m=\tilde{D}\cdot E\geqslant\mathrm{mult}_R\Big(\tilde{D}\cdot E\Big)>\frac{5}{4}$$

by Lemma 2.18. The obtained contradiction shows that either $R = \tilde{E}_2 \cap E$ or $R = \tilde{E}_3 \cap E$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $R = \tilde{E}_2 \cap E$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(\tilde{X}, \omega\tilde{D} + \omega a_2\tilde{E}_2 + \Big(\omega a_2 + \omega a_3 + \omega\mathrm{mult}_Q\big(\bar{D}\big) - 1\Big)E\Big)$$

is not log canonical at the point R. Hence, it follows from Lemma 2.18 that

$$\frac{5}{4} - a_2 > \frac{6}{5} - a_2 = 2 - \frac{4}{5} - a_2 \geqslant 2 - a_2 - a_3 \geqslant m = \tilde{D}\cdot E \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_R\Big(\tilde{D}\cdot E\Big) > \frac{5}{4} - a_2,$$

because $m + a_2 + a_3 \leqslant 2$. The obtained contradiction concludes the proof. ☐

The following result is proved in [9].

Theorem 5.4. Let X be a quasismooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(11, 21, 29, 37)$ of degree 95. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) = \frac{11}{4}.$$

Proof. We may assume that X is defined by the quasihomogeneous equation

$$t^2y + tz^2 + xy^4 + x^6z = 0 \subset \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x, y, z, t\big]\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{wt}(x) = 11$, $\mathrm{wt}(y) = 21$, $\mathrm{wt}(z) = 29$, $\mathrm{wt}(t) = 37$.

Let O_x be the point on X that is given by $y = z = t = 0$. Then O_x is a singular point of type

$$\frac{1}{11}\big(5, 2\big)$$

of the surface X. Let us define singular points O_y, O_z and O_t of the surface X in a way similar to the way we defined the point O_x. Then O_y, O_z and O_t are singular points of types

$$\frac{1}{21}\big(1, 2\big),\ \frac{1}{29}\big(11, 21\big),\ \frac{1}{37}\big(11, 29\big)$$

of the surface X, respectively.

Let C_x be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $x = 0$. Then

$$C_x = L_{xt} + R_x,$$

where L_{xt} and R_x are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{xt} is given by the equations $x = t = 0$, and the curve R_x is given by the equations $x = yt + z^2 = 0$. We have

$$\mathrm{lct}\left(X, \frac{3}{11}C_x\right) = \frac{11}{4},$$

which implies that $\mathrm{lct}(X) \leqslant 11/4$.

Let C_y be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $y = 0$. Then

$$C_y = L_{yz} + R_y,$$

where L_{yz} and R_y are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{yz} is given by the equations $y = z = 0$, and the curve R_y is given by the equations $y = zt + x^6 = 0$.

Let C_z be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $z = 0$. Then

$$C_z = L_{yz} + R_z,$$

where R_z is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $z = xy^3 + t^2 = 0$.

Let C_t be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $t = 0$. Then

$$C_t = L_{xt} + R_t,$$

where R_t is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $t = y^4 + x^5z = 0$.

The intersection numbers among the divisors D, L_{xt}, L_{yz}, R_x, R_y, R_z, R_t are as follows:

$$D\cdot L_{xt}=\frac{1}{7\cdot 29},\quad D\cdot R_x=\frac{2}{7\cdot 37},\quad D\cdot R_y=\frac{18}{29\cdot 37},$$

$$D\cdot L_{yz}=\frac{3}{11\cdot 37},\quad D\cdot R_z=\frac{2}{7\cdot 11},\quad D\cdot R_t=\frac{12}{11\cdot 29},$$

$$L_{xt}\cdot R_x=\frac{2}{21},\quad L_{yz}\cdot R_y=\frac{6}{37},\quad L_{yz}\cdot R_z=\frac{2}{11},\quad L_{xt}\cdot R_t=\frac{4}{29},$$

$$L_{xt}^2=-\frac{47}{21\cdot 29},\quad R_x^2=-\frac{52}{21\cdot 37},\quad R_y^2=-\frac{48}{29\cdot 37},$$

$$L_{yz}^2=-\frac{45}{11\cdot 37},\quad R_z^2=\frac{16}{11\cdot 21},\quad R_t^2=\frac{104}{11\cdot 29}.$$

We have $L_{xt}\cap R_x=\{O_y\}$, $L_{yz}\cap R_y=\{O_t\}$, $L_{yz}\cap R_z=\{O_x\}$, $L_{xt}\cap R_t=\{O_z\}$. We have

$$\min\Bigg(\mathrm{lct}\Bigg(X,\frac{3}{21}C_y\Bigg),\mathrm{lct}\Bigg(X,\frac{3}{29}C_z\Bigg),\mathrm{lct}\Bigg(X,\frac{3}{37}C_t\Bigg)\Bigg)\geqslant\frac{11}{4}.$$

Put $\omega=11/4$. Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X)<\omega$. Then, there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$D\equiv -K_X$$

such that the log pair $(X,\omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $P\in X$.

By Remark 2.6 we may assume that the support of the divisor D does not contain at least one component of each divisor C_x, C_y, C_z, C_t. The inequalities

$$21\Big(D\cdot L_{xt}\Big)=\frac{3}{29}<\frac{4}{11}>\frac{6}{37}=21\Big(D\cdot R_x\Big)$$

imply that $P\neq O_y$. Similarly, we see that $P\neq O_x$. The inequalities

$$29\Big(D\cdot L_{xt}\Big)=\frac{1}{7}<\frac{4}{11}>\frac{3}{11}=\frac{29}{4}\Big(D\cdot R_t\Big)$$

imply that $P\neq O_z$, because the curve R_t is singular at O_z, and its orbifold multiplicity at the point O_z equals to 4.

Put $D=mL_{xt}+\Omega$, where m is a non-negative rational number, and Ω is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor whose support does not contain L_{xt}. Then $m\leqslant 4/11$, because the log pair $(X,\omega D)$ is log canonical at the point O_y. Then

$$\Big(D-mL_{xt}\Big)\cdot L_{xt}=\frac{3+47m}{21\cdot 29}\leqslant\frac{4}{11},$$

which implies that $P\in L_{xt}$ by Lemma 2.18. Similarly, we see that either $P=O_t$ or

$$P\notin C_x\cup C_y\cup C_z\cup C_t.$$

Suppose that $P\neq O_t$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the pencil that is cut out on X by the equation

$$\lambda yt+\mu z^2=0,$$

where $[\lambda:\mu]\in\mathbb{P}^1$. The base locus of the pencil $\mathcal{L}$ consists of the curve L_{yz} and the point O_y.

Let E be the unique curve in $\mathcal{L}$ that passes through P. Then E is cut out on X by

$$z^2=\alpha yt$$

for some non-zero $\alpha\in\mathbb{C}$, because $P\notin C_x\cup C_y\cup C_z\cup C_t$.

Suppose that $\alpha\neq -1$. Then E is isomorphic to the curve defined by the equations

$$yt-z^2=t^2y+xy^4+x^6z=0,$$

which implies that E is smooth at the point P. Moreover, we have

$$E = L_{yz} + C,$$

where C is an irreducible and reduced curve. Then $P \in C$. We have

$$D \cdot C = D \cdot E - D \cdot L_{yz} = \frac{169}{7 \cdot 11 \cdot 37},$$

and $C^2 > 0$. Arguing as above, we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 2.18.

Suppose that $\alpha = -1$. Then $E = L_{yz} + R_x + M$, where M is an irreducible and reduced curve, which is smooth at the point P. We have

$$D \cdot M = D \cdot E - D \cdot L_{yz} - D \cdot R_x = \frac{147}{7 \cdot 11 \cdot 37},$$

and $M^2 > 0$. Arguing as above, we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 2.18.

Therefore, we see that $P = O_t$. Put

$$D = \Delta + aL_{yz} + bR_x,$$

where a and b are non-negative rational numbers, and Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor whose support contains neither L_{yz} nor R_x. Then $a > 0$ since otherwise we would obtain an absurd inequality

$$\frac{3}{11} = 37D \cdot L_{yz} \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D) > \frac{4}{11}.$$

Note that $R_y \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$, because $a > 0$.

If $b > 0$, then L_{xt} is not contained in the support of D, and hence

$$\frac{3}{21 \cdot 29} = D \cdot L_{xt} \geqslant b\Big(R_x \cdot L_{xt}\Big) = \frac{2b}{21},$$

which implies that $b \leqslant 3/58$. Similarly, we have

$$\frac{18}{29 \cdot 37} = D \cdot R_y \geqslant \frac{6a}{37} + \frac{b}{37} + \frac{\mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D) - a - b}{37} > \frac{5a}{37} + \frac{4}{11 \cdot 37},$$

and hence $a < 82/1595$. One can easily check that the equality

$$\Delta \cdot L_{yz} = \frac{3}{11 \cdot 37} + a\frac{45}{11 \cdot 37} - \frac{b}{37}$$

holds. Similarly, one can easily check that the equality

$$\Delta \cdot R_x = \frac{2}{7 \cdot 37} + b\frac{52}{21 \cdot 37} - \frac{a}{37}$$

holds. Thus, applying Theorem 1.3 to the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ \omega\Delta + \omega a L_{yz} + \omega b R_x\Big)$$

with $M = 3/11$, $N = 2/7$, $A = 45/11$, $B = 52/21$, $\alpha = 675/197$ and $\beta = 77/197$, we see that

$$\frac{24681}{45704} = \alpha\omega a + \beta\omega b > 1,$$

which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 5.5. Let X be a quasismooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(13, 14, 23, 33)$ of degree 79. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) = \frac{65}{32}.$$

Proof. The surface X can be defined by the quasihomogeneous equation

$$z^2t+y^4z+xt^2+x^5y=0\subset \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x,y,z,t\big]\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{wt}(x)=13$, $\mathrm{wt}(y)=14$, $\mathrm{wt}(z)=23$, $\mathrm{wt}(t)=33$.

Let us define points O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t as in the proof of Theorem 5.7. Then O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t are singular points of the surface X of types

$$\frac{1}{13}\big(1,2\big),\ \frac{1}{14}\big(13,5\big),\ \frac{1}{23}\big(13,14\big),\ \frac{1}{33}\big(14,23\big),$$

respectively.

Let C_x be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $x=0$. Then

$$C_x=L_{xz}+R_x,$$

where L_{xz} and R_x are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{xt} is given by the equations $x=z=0$, and the curve R_x is given by the equations $x=y^4+zt=0$.

Let C_y be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $y=0$. Then

$$C_y=L_{yt}+R_y,$$

where L_{yt} and R_y are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{yt} is given by the equations $y=t=0$, and the curve R_y is given by the equations $y=z^2+xt=0$.

Let C_z be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $z=0$. Then

$$C_z=L_{xz}+R_z,$$

where R_z is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $z=x^4y+t^2=0$.

Let C_t be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $t=0$. Then

$$C_t=L_{yt}+R_t,$$

where R_t is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $t=x^5+y^3z=0$.

The intersection numbers among the divisors D, L_{xz}, L_{yt}, R_x, R_y, R_z, R_t are as follows:

$$L_{xz}^2=-\frac{43}{14\cdot 33},\ R_x^2=-\frac{40}{23\cdot 33},\ L_{xz}\cdot R_x=\frac{4}{33},\ D\cdot L_{xz}=\frac{4}{14\cdot 33},\ D\cdot R_x=\frac{16}{23\cdot 33},$$
$$L_{yt}^2=-\frac{32}{13\cdot 23},\ R_y^2=-\frac{38}{13\cdot 33},\ L_{yt}\cdot R_y=\frac{2}{13},\ D\cdot L_{yt}=\frac{4}{13\cdot 23},\ D\cdot R_y=\frac{8}{13\cdot 33},$$
$$R_z^2=\frac{20}{13\cdot 14},\ L_{xz}\cdot R_z=\frac{2}{14},\ D\cdot R_z=\frac{8}{13\cdot 14},\ R_t^2=\frac{95}{14\cdot 13},\ L_{yt}\cdot R_t=\frac{5}{23},$$
$$D\cdot R_t=\frac{20}{14\cdot 23},\ R_y\cdot R_x=L_{xz}\cdot R_y=\frac{1}{33},\ R_x\cdot L_{yt}=\frac{1}{23}.$$

We have $L_{xz}\cap R_x=\{O_t\}$, $L_{xz}\cap R_z=\{O_y\}$, $L_{yt}\cap R_y=\{O_x\}$, $L_{yt}\cap R_t=\{O_z\}$. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{4}{13}C_x\right)=\frac{65}{32}<\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{4}{14}C_y\right)=\frac{21}{8}<\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{4}{25}C_t\right)=\frac{33}{10}<\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{4}{23}C_z\right)=\frac{69}{20},$$

which implies, in particular, that $\mathrm{lct}(X)\leqslant 65/32$.

Put $\omega=65/32$. Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X)<\omega$. Then, there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$D\equiv -K_X$$

such that the log pair $(X,\omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $P\in X$.

By Remark 2.6 we may assume that $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one component of every curve C_x, C_y, C_z and C_t. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.7, we see that $P=O_t$ (see [9]).

The curve L_{xz} is contained in $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$, because otherwise we have

$$\mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D)\leqslant 33\Big(D\cdot L_{xz}\Big)=\frac{2}{7}<\frac{32}{65},$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we see that $R_x \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$. Put

$$D = \Delta + aL_{xz} + bR_y,$$

where a and b are non-negative rational numbers, and Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor whose support does contain the curves L_{xz} and R_y. Then

$$\frac{16}{23\cdot 33} = D\cdot R_x \geqslant a\Big(L_{xz}\cdot R_x\Big) + \frac{\mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D) - a}{33} > \frac{3a}{33} + \frac{32}{33\cdot 65},$$

which implies that $a < 304/4485$. If $b \neq 0$, then $L_{yt} \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$ and

$$\frac{4}{13\cdot 23} = D\cdot L_{yt} \geqslant b\Big(R_y\cdot L_{yt}\Big) = \frac{2b}{13},$$

which implies that $b \leqslant 2/23$. We know that the equality

$$33\Big(\Delta\cdot L_{xz}\Big) = \frac{4}{14} + a\frac{43}{14} - b$$

holds. Similarly, we know that the equality

$$33\Big(\Delta\cdot R_y\Big) = \frac{8}{13} + b\frac{38}{23} - a$$

holds. Thus, putting $M = 4/14$, $N = 8/13$, $A = 43/14$, $B = 38/23$ $\alpha = 700771/301108$ and

$$\beta = \frac{69069}{150554},$$

and applying Theorem 1.3 to the log pair $(X, \omega\Delta + \omega aL_{xz} + \omega bR_y)$, we see that

$$\frac{66727051}{166211616} = \alpha\omega a + \beta\omega b > 1,$$

which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 5.6. Let X be a quasismooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(11, 17, 24, 31)$ of degree 79. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) = \frac{33}{16}.$$

Proof. The surface X can be defined by the quasihomogeneous equation

$$t^2y + tz^2 + xy^4 + x^5z = 0 \subset \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x, y, z, t\big]\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{wt}(x) = 11$, $\mathrm{wt}(y) = 17$, $\mathrm{wt}(z) = 24$, $\mathrm{wt}(t) = 31$.

Let us define points O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t as in the proof of Theorem 5.7. Then O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t are singular points of the surface X of types

$$\frac{1}{11}\big(2, 3\big),\ \frac{1}{17}\big(1, 2\big),\ \frac{1}{24}\big(11, 17\big),\ \frac{1}{31}\big(11, 24\big),$$

respectively.

Let C_x be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $x = 0$. Then

$$C_x = L_{xt} + R_x,$$

where L_{xt} and R_x are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{xt} is given by the equations $x = t = 0$, and the curve R_x is given by the equations $x = yt + z^2 = 0$.

Let C_y be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $y = 0$. Then

$$C_y = L_{yz} + R_y,$$

where L_{yz} and R_y are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{yz} is given by the equations $y = z = 0$, and the curve R_y is given by the equations $y = zt + x^5 = 0$.

Let C_z be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $z = 0$. Then

$$C_z = L_{yz} + R_z,$$

where R_z is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $z = xy^3 + t^2 = 0$.

Let C_t be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $t = 0$. Then

$$C_t = L_{xt} + R_t,$$

where R_t is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $t = y^4 + x^4z = 0$.

The intersection numbers among the divisors D, L_{xt}, L_{yz}, R_x, R_y, R_z, R_t are as follows:

$$D\cdot L_{xt} = \frac{1}{6\cdot 17},\quad D\cdot R_x = \frac{8}{17\cdot 31},\quad D\cdot R_y = \frac{5}{6\cdot 31},$$

$$D\cdot L_{yz} = \frac{4}{11\cdot 31},\quad D\cdot R_z = \frac{8}{11\cdot 17},\quad D\cdot R_t = \frac{2}{3\cdot 11},$$

$$L_{xt}\cdot R_x = \frac{2}{17},\quad L_{yz}\cdot R_y = \frac{5}{31},\quad L_{yz}\cdot R_z = \frac{2}{11},\quad L_{xt}\cdot R_t = \frac{1}{6},$$

$$L_{xt}^2 = -\frac{37}{17\cdot 24},\quad R_x^2 = -\frac{40}{17\cdot 31},\quad R_y^2 = -\frac{35}{24\cdot 31},$$

$$L_{yz}^2 = -\frac{38}{11\cdot 31},\quad R_z^2 = \frac{14}{11\cdot 17},\quad R_t^2 = \frac{10}{3\cdot 11}.$$

We have $L_{xt}\cap R_x = \{O_y\}$, $L_{yz}\cap R_y = \{O_t\}$, $L_{yz}\cap R_z = \{O_x\}$, $L_{xt}\cap R_t = \{O_z\}$. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\left(X, \frac{4}{11}C_x\right) = \frac{33}{16} < \max\left(\mathrm{lct}\left(X, \frac{4}{17}C_y\right),\ \mathrm{lct}\left(X, \frac{4}{24}C_z\right),\ \mathrm{lct}\left(X, \frac{4}{31}C_t\right)\right),$$

which implies, in particular, that $\mathrm{lct}(X) \leqslant 33/16$.

Put $\omega = 33/16$. Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X) < \omega$. Then, there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$D \equiv -K_X$$

such that the log pair $(X, \omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $P \in X$.

By Remark 2.6 we may assume that $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one component of every curve C_x, C_y, C_z and C_t. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.7, we see that $P = O_t$ (see [9]).

The curve L_{yz} is contained in $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$, because otherwise we have

$$31\Big(D\cdot L_{yz}\Big) = \frac{4}{11} < \frac{16}{33},$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we see that $R_y \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$. Put

$$D = \Delta + aL_{yz} + bR_x,$$

where a and b are non-negative rational numbers, and Δ is an effective divisor whose support does not contain the curves L_{yz} and R_x. Then it follows from the inequality

$$\frac{1}{6\cdot 17} = D\cdot L_{xt} \geqslant b\Big(R_x\cdot L_{xt}\Big) = \frac{2b}{17}$$

that $b \leqslant 1/12$. On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{5}{6\cdot 31} = D\cdot R_y \geqslant \frac{5a}{31} + \frac{b}{31} + \frac{\mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D) - a - b}{31} > \frac{4a}{31} + \frac{16}{31\cdot 33},$$

which implies that $a < 23/264$. We know that the equality

$$31\Big(\Delta\cdot L_{yz}\Big) = \frac{4}{11} + a\frac{38}{11} - b$$

holds. Similarly, we know that the equality

$$31\Big(\Delta\cdot R_x\Big) = \frac{8}{17} + b\frac{40}{17} - a$$

holds. Thus, applying Theorem 1.3 to the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ \omega\Delta+\omega aL_{yz}+\omega bR_{x}\Big)$$

with $M=4/11$, $N=8/17$, $A=38/11$, $B=40/17$, $\alpha=1444/453$ and $\beta=187/453$, we see that

$$\frac{6221}{9664}=\alpha\omega a+\beta\omega b>1,$$

which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 5.7. Let X be a quasismooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(13,17,27,41)$ of degree 95. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big)=\frac{65}{24}.$$

Proof. The surface X can be defined by the quasihomogeneous equation

$$z^{2}t+y^{4}z+xt^{2}+x^{6}y=0\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x,y,z,t\big]\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{wt}(x)=13$, $\mathrm{wt}(y)=17$, $\mathrm{wt}(z)=27$, $\mathrm{wt}(t)=41$.

Let us define points O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t as in the proof of Theorem 5.7. Then O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t are singular points of the surface X of types

$$\frac{1}{13}\big(1,2\big),\ \frac{1}{17}\big(13,7\big),\ \frac{1}{27}\big(13,17\big),\ \frac{1}{41}\big(17,27\big),$$

respectively.

Let C_x be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $x=0$. Then

$$C_x=L_{xz}+R_x,$$

where L_{xz} and R_x are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{xt} is given by the equations $x=z=0$, and the curve R_x is given by the equations $x=y^4+zt=0$.

Let C_y be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $y=0$. Then

$$C_y=L_{yt}+R_y,$$

where L_{yt} and R_y are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{yt} is given by the equations $y=t=0$, and the curve R_y is given by the equations $y=z^2+xt=0$.

Let C_z be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $z=0$. Then

$$C_z=L_{xz}+R_z,$$

where R_z is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $z=t^2+x^5y=0$.

Let C_t be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $t=0$. Then

$$C_t=L_{yt}+R_t,$$

where R_t is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $t=x^6+y^3z=0$.

The intersection numbers among the divisors D, L_{xz}, L_{yt}, R_x, R_y, R_z, R_t are as follows:

$$D\cdot L_{xz}=\frac{3}{17\cdot 41},\ D\cdot L_{yt}=\frac{1}{9\cdot 13},\ D\cdot R_x=\frac{4}{9\cdot 41},$$
$$D\cdot R_y=\frac{6}{13\cdot 41},\ D\cdot R_z=\frac{6}{13\cdot 17},\ D\cdot R_t=\frac{2}{3\cdot 17},$$
$$L_{xz}^2=-\frac{55}{17\cdot 41},\ L_{yt}^2=-\frac{37}{13\cdot 27},\ R_x^2=-\frac{56}{27\cdot 41},\ R_y^2=-\frac{48}{13\cdot 41},\ R_z^2=\frac{28}{13\cdot 17}$$
$$R_t^2=\frac{16}{3\cdot 17},\ L_{xz}\cdot R_x=\frac{4}{41},\ L_{yt}\cdot R_y=\frac{2}{13},\ L_{xz}\cdot R_z=\frac{2}{17},\ L_{yt}\cdot R_t=\frac{2}{9}.$$

We have $L_{xz}\cap R_x=\{O_t\}$, $L_{xz}\cap R_z=\{O_y\}$, $L_{yt}\cap R_y=\{O_x\}$, $L_{yt}\cap R_t=\{O_z\}$. Then

$$\frac{65}{24}=\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{3}{13}C_x\right)<\frac{51}{12}=\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{3}{17}C_y\right)<\frac{41}{8}=\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{3}{41}C_t\right)<\frac{21}{4}=\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{3}{27}C_z\right).$$

which implies that $\mathrm{lct}(X) \leqslant 65/24$.

Put $\omega = 65/24$. Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X) < \omega$. Then, there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$D \equiv -K_X$$

such that the log pair $(X, \omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $P \in X$.

By Remark 2.6 we may assume that $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one component of every curve C_x, C_y, C_z and C_t. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.7, we see that $P = O_t$ (see [9]).

The curve L_{xz} is contained in $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$, because otherwise we have

$$\frac{24}{65} < \mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D) \leqslant 41\Big(D \cdot L_{xz}\Big) = \frac{3}{17} < \frac{24}{65},$$

which is a contradiction. Then $R_x \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}(D)$. Put

$$D = aL_{xz} + bR_y + \Delta,$$

where a and b are non-negative rational numbers, and Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor whose support does not contain the curves L_{xz} nor R_y. Then

$$\frac{4}{9 \cdot 41} = D \cdot R_x \geqslant a\Big(L_{xz} \cdot R_x\Big) + \frac{\mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D) - a}{41} > \frac{3a}{41} + \frac{24}{41 \cdot 65},$$

which implies that $a \leqslant 44/585$. If $b \neq 0$, then

$$\frac{1}{9 \cdot 13} = D \cdot L_{yt} \geqslant b\Big(R_y \cdot L_{yt}\Big) = \frac{2b}{13},$$

which implies that $b \leqslant 1/18$. We know that the equality

$$41\Big(\Delta \cdot L_{xz}\Big) = \frac{3}{17} + a\frac{55}{17} - b$$

holds. Similarly, we know that the equality

$$41\Big(\Delta \cdot R_y\Big) = \frac{6}{13} + b\frac{48}{41} - a$$

holds. Thus, applying Theorem 1.3 to the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ \omega\Delta + \omega a L_{xz} + \omega b R_y\Big)$$

with $M = 6/13$, $N = 3/17$, $A = 48/41$, $B = 55/17$ $\alpha = 29952/19505$ and $\beta = 5729/19505$, we get

$$\frac{306379}{1053270} = \alpha\omega b + \beta\omega a > 1,$$

which is a contradiction. ☐

Theorem 5.8. Let X be a quasismooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(14, 17, 29, 41)$ of degree 99. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big) = \frac{51}{10}.$$

Proof. The surface X can be defined by the quasihomogeneous equation

$$t^2y + tz^2 + xy^5 + x^5z = 0 \subset \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x, y, z, t\big]\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{wt}(x) = 14$, $\mathrm{wt}(y) = 17$, $\mathrm{wt}(z) = 29$, $\mathrm{wt}(t) = 41$.

Let us define points O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t as in the proof of Theorem 5.7. Then O_x, O_y, O_z, O_t are singular points of the surface X of types

$$\frac{1}{14}\big(3, 13\big),\ \frac{1}{17}\big(12, 7\big),\ \frac{1}{29}\big(11, 17\big),\ \frac{1}{41}\big(14, 29\big),$$

respectively.

Let C_x be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $x = 0$. Then

$$C_x = L_{xt} + R_x,$$

where L_{xt} and R_x are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{xt} is given by the equations $x=t=0$, and the curve R_x is given by the equations $x=yt+z^2=0$.

Let C_y be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $y=0$. Then

$$C_y=L_{yz}+R_y,$$

where L_{yz} and R_y are irreducible reduced curves on the surface X such that L_{yz} is given by the equations $y=z=0$, and the curve R_y is given by the equations $y=zt+x^5=0$.

Let C_z be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $z=0$. Then

$$C_z=L_{yz}+R_z,$$

where R_z is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $z=xy^4+t^2=0$.

Let C_t be the curve that is cut out on X by the equation $t=0$. Then

$$C_t=L_{xt}+R_t,$$

where R_t is an irreducible reduced curve that is given by the equations $t=y^5+x^4z=0$.

The intersection numbers among the divisors D, L_{xt}, L_{yz}, R_x, R_y, R_z, R_t are as follows:

$$D\cdot L_{xt}=\frac{2}{17\cdot 29},\quad D\cdot R_x=\frac{4}{17\cdot 41},\quad D\cdot R_y=\frac{10}{29\cdot 41},$$
$$D\cdot L_{yz}=\frac{1}{7\cdot 41},\quad D\cdot R_z=\frac{2}{7\cdot 17},\quad D\cdot R_t=\frac{5}{7\cdot 29},$$
$$L_{xt}\cdot R_x=\frac{2}{17},\quad L_{yz}\cdot R_y=\frac{5}{41},\quad L_{yz}\cdot R_z=\frac{1}{7},\quad L_{xt}\cdot R_t=\frac{5}{29},$$
$$L_{xt}^2=-\frac{44}{17\cdot 29},\quad R_x^2=-\frac{54}{17\cdot 41},\quad R_y^2=-\frac{60}{29\cdot 41},$$
$$L_{yz}^2=-\frac{53}{14\cdot 41},\quad R_z^2=\frac{12}{7\cdot 17},\quad R_t^2=\frac{135}{14\cdot 29}.$$

We have $L_{xt}\cap R_x=\{O_y\}$, $L_{yz}\cap R_y=\{O_t\}$, $L_{yz}\cap R_z=\{O_x\}$, $L_{xt}\cap R_t=\{O_z\}$. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{2}{17}C_y\right)=\frac{51}{10}<\max\left(\mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{2}{14}C_x\right),\ \mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{2}{29}C_z\right),\ \mathrm{lct}\left(X,\frac{2}{41}C_t\right)\right),$$

which implies that $\mathrm{lct}(X)\leqslant 51/10$.

Put $\omega=51/10$. Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X)<\omega$. Then, there is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$D\equiv -K_X$$

such that the log pair $(X,\omega D)$ is not log canonical at some point $P\in X$.

By Remark 2.6 we may assume that $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$ does not contain at least one irreducible component of every curve C_x, C_y, C_z and C_t.

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.7, we see that $P=O_t$. Put

$$D=aL_{yz}+bR_x+\Delta,$$

where a and b are non-negative rational numbers, and Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor whose support contains neither L_{yz} nor R_x. Then $a>0$, because otherwise we have

$$\frac{1}{7}=41\Big(D\cdot L_{yz}\Big)\geqslant \mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D)>\frac{10}{51},$$

which is a contradiction. Then $R_y\not\subset\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$. If $b>0$, then

$$\frac{2}{17\cdot 29}=D\cdot L_{xt}\geqslant b\Big(R_x\cdot L_{xt}\Big)=\frac{2b}{17},$$

which implies that $b\leqslant 1/19$. Similarly, we see that

$$\frac{10}{29\cdot 41}=D\cdot R_y\geqslant\frac{5a}{41}+\frac{b}{41}+\frac{\mathrm{mult}_{O_t}(D)-a-b}{41}>\frac{4a}{41}+\frac{4}{21\cdot 41},$$

which implies that $a < 47/1218$. We know that the equality

$$41\Big(\Delta\cdot L_{yz}\Big)=\frac{2}{14}+a\frac{53}{14}-b$$

holds. Similarly, we know that the equality

$$41\Big(\Delta\cdot R_{x}\Big)=\frac{4}{17}+b\frac{54}{17}-a$$

holds. Thus, applying Theorem 1.3 to the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ \omega\Delta+\omega aL_{yz}+\omega bR_{x}\Big)$$

with $M=1/7$, $N=4/17$, $A=53/14$, $B=54/17$, $\alpha=2809/874$ and $\beta=119/437$, we see that

$$\frac{2414323}{3548440}=\alpha\omega a+\beta\omega b>1,$$

which is a contradiction. □

It should be pointed out that singular del Pezzo surfaces that satisfy the hypotheses of Theorems 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 admit a Kähler–Einstein metric by Theorem 5.1.

6. ICOSAHEDRON

Fix embeddings $\mathbb{A}_5\cong G_1\subset\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1)$ and $\mathbb{A}_5\cong G_2\subset\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^2)$, fix the induced embedding

$$\mathbb{A}_5\times\mathbb{A}_5\cong G_1\times G_2\subset\mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^2\Big)\cong\mathbb{PGL}\big(2,\mathbb{C}\big)\times\mathbb{PGL}\big(2,\mathbb{C}\big),$$

put $G=G_1\times G_2$ and $X=\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^2$. Let $\pi_1\colon X\to\mathbb{P}^1$ and $\pi_2\colon X\to\mathbb{P}^2$ be natural projections. Then

$$\mathcal{P}\big(X,G\big)\supseteq\big\{\pi_1,\pi_2\big\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}(X,G)$ is the G-pliability of the variety X (see Definition A.9).

Theorem 6.1. The equality $\mathcal{P}(X,G)=\{\pi_1,\pi_2\}$ holds.

It follows from Theorem 6.1 that there is no G-equivariant birational map $X \dashrightarrow V$ such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Cl}^G\big(V\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big)=1,$$

and V is a Fano threefold with at most terminal singularities.

Corollary 6.2. Let $\gamma\colon X\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^3$ be any birational map. Then the subgroup

$$\gamma\circ G\circ\gamma^{-1}\subset\mathrm{Bir}\big(\mathbb{P}^3\big)$$

is not conjugate to any subgroup in $\mathbb{PGL}(3,\mathbb{C})\cong\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)\subset\mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^3)$.

Similarly, It follows from Theorem 6.1 that

- for any G-equivariant rational map $\xi\colon X\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^1$ whose general fiber is a rational surface, there are maps $\rho\in\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ and $\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1)$ such that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\rho"] \arrow[d, "\pi_1"'] & X \arrow[d, "\xi"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[r, "\sigma"] & \mathbb{P}^1,
\end{tikzcd}$$

- for any G-equivariant rational map $\xi\colon X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ whose general fiber is a rational curve, there are maps $\rho \in \mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^2)$ such that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\rho"] \arrow[d, "\pi_2"'] & X \arrow[d, "\xi"] \\
\mathbb{P}^2 \arrow[r, dashed, "\sigma"] & \mathbb{P}^2.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Theorem 6.3. The isomorphism $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X) \cong \mathbb{A}_5 \times \mathbb{S}_5$ holds.

Proof. Let ξ be an element in $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$. Using the notations of the proof of Theorem 6.1, put

$$\bar{X} = X,\ \bar{\pi} = \pi_1,\ \nu = \xi.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 6.1, we see that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\xi"] \arrow[d, "\pi_1"'] & X \arrow[d, "\pi_1"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[r, "\sigma"'] & \mathbb{P}^1,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}^{G_1}(\mathbb{P}^1)$. Then it follows from Remark A.28 and Theorem B.12 that

- either ξ induces an isomorphism of the generic fiber of π_1,
- or $\xi \circ \tau$ induces an isomorphism of the generic fiber of π_1 for some $\tau \in \mathrm{Bir}^{G_2}(\mathbb{P}^2)$,

which implies that either ξ or $\xi \circ \tau$ is biregular by [7, Theorem 1.5] and [5, Example 5.4]. Then

$$\mathrm{Bir}^G\big(X\big) \cong \mathrm{Aut}^{G_1}\big(\mathbb{P}^1\big) \times \mathrm{Bir}^{G_2}\big(\mathbb{P}^2\big),$$

but $\mathrm{Aut}^{G_1}(\mathbb{P}^1) \cong \mathbb{A}_5$ and $\mathrm{Bir}^{G_2}(\mathbb{P}^2) \cong \mathbb{S}_5$ by Theorem 6.1. □

Let us prove Theorem 6.1. Suppose that $\mathcal{P}(X, G) \neq \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$. Let us derive a contradiction.

There is a G-Mori fibration $\bar{\pi}\colon \bar{X} \to \bar{S}$ that is not square birationally equivalent neither to the fibration π_1 nor to π_2, and there is a G-equivariant birational map $\nu\colon \bar{X} \dashrightarrow X$. Put

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}} = \Big|\bar{\pi}^*\big(D\big)\Big|$$

for a very ample divisor D on the variety $\bar{S}$ in the case when $\dim(\bar{S}) \neq 0$, and put

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}} = \Big| - mK_{\bar{X}}\Big|$$

for a sufficiently big and divisible $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in the case when $\dim(\bar{S}) = 0$. Put $\mathcal{M}_X = \nu(\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}})$.

Lemma 6.4. For every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there is $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\lambda_i > 0$ and

$$K_X + \lambda_i \mathcal{M}_X \equiv \pi_i^*\big(H_i\big),$$

where H_i is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on $\mathbb{P}^i$.

Proof. The existence of positive rational numbers λ_1 and λ_2 is obvious in the case when the equality $\dim(\bar{S}) = 0$ holds. Thus, we may assume that either $\dim(\bar{S}) = 1$ or $\dim(\bar{S}) = 2$.

The fibration $\bar{\pi}$ is not square birational to π_1. Thus, the existence of λ_1 is obvious.

The fibration $\bar{\pi}$ is not square birational to π_2, which implies the existence of λ_2 in the case when $\dim(\bar{S}) = 2$. Hence, we may assume that $\dim(\bar{S}) = 1$. Then $\bar{S} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$.

Suppose that λ_2 does not exist. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{X} \arrow[r, dashed, "\nu"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\pi}"'] & X \arrow[d, "\pi_2"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 & \mathbb{P}^2, \arrow[l, dashed, "\zeta"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ζ is a rational dominant map. The normalization of a general fiber of ζ is a rational curve, because general fiber of $\bar{\pi}$ is a rational surface. On the other hand, the map ζ is G_2-equivariant, which is impossible, because $\mathbb{P}^2$ is G_2-birationally rigid by Theorem B.12. ☐

Let D be a general fiber of π_1. Then it follows from Theorems A.16 and B.12 that

- either the log pair $(D, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X|_D)$ has canonical singularities,
- or there is an involution $\tau \in \mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ such that the log pair
$$\left(D, \lambda_1'\tau\big(\mathcal{M}_X\big)\Big|_D\right)$$
has canonical singularities, where $\lambda_1' \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that
$$K_X + \lambda_1'\tau\big(\mathcal{M}_X\big) \equiv \pi_1^*\big(H_1'\big),$$
where H_1' is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on $\mathbb{P}^1$.

Corollary 6.5. We may assume that $(D, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X|_D)$ has canonical singularities.

There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& W \arrow[dl, "\alpha"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta"] & \\
X & & \bar{X}, \arrow[ll, dashed, "\nu"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where α and β are G-equivariant birational morphisms, and W is a smooth variety.

Let $\mathcal{M}_W$ be a proper transform of $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}$ on the variety W. Take $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then

$$\alpha^*\Big(K_X + \epsilon\mathcal{M}_X\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^\epsilon F_i \equiv K_W + \epsilon\mathcal{M}_W \equiv \beta^*\Big(K_{\bar{X}} + \epsilon\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i^\epsilon E_i,$$

where a_i^ϵ is a rational number, b_i^ϵ is a positive rational number, F_i is an exceptional prime divisor of the morphism α, and E_i is an exceptional prime divisor of the morphism β.

Lemma 6.6. The inequality $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $\lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_1$. Then H_2 is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective and nef.

Using Lemmas A.14 and A.15, we may assume that there is $l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that the surfaces $F_1, \ldots, F_l$ are all α-exceptional divisors such that $F_1, \ldots, F_l$ are not contracted by the morphism β, and $a_1^{\lambda_2}, \ldots, a_l^{\lambda_2}$ are negative rational numbers.

Put $Z_i = \alpha(F_i)$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. Then

- either $\pi_2(Z_i)$ is an irreducible curve,
- or $\pi_2(Z_i)$ is a closed point.

Suppose that $\dim(\pi_2(Z_i)) = 1$. Let Γ_i be a fiber of π_2 over a general point of $\pi_2(Z_i)$. Then

$$2 = \lambda_2\mathcal{M}_X \cdot \Gamma_i \geqslant \lambda_2\mathrm{mult}_{Z_i}\big(\mathcal{M}_X\big)\big|Z_i \cap \Gamma_i\big| \geqslant 12\lambda_2\mathrm{mult}_{Z_i}\big(\mathcal{M}_X\big),$$

because the smallest G_1-orbit in $\mathbb{P}^1$ consists of 12 points (see [30]). Thus, we see that $i > l$.

Thus, we see that $\pi_2(Z_i)$ is a closed point for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$.

It follows from [26, Proposition 1] that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& U \arrow[rr, "\delta"] \arrow[dl, "\gamma"'] & & W \arrow[dl, "\alpha"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta"] & \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \times S \arrow[rr, "\upsilon"] \arrow[d, "\iota"'] & & X \arrow[d, "\pi_2"] & & \bar{X}, \arrow[ll, dashed, "\nu"'] \\
S \arrow[rr, "\omega"'] & & \mathbb{P}^2 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where S is a smooth surface, ω is a G_2-invariant birational morphism, υ is an induced birational morphism, U is a smooth threefold, γ and δ are G-invariant birational morphisms, and

$$\dim\Big(\iota \circ \gamma\big(\bar{F}_i\big)\Big) = 1,$$

where $\bar{F}_i$ is a proper transform of F_i on the variety U, and $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Put $V = \mathbb{P}^1 \times S$.

Let $\mathcal{M}_U$ and $\mathcal{M}_V$ be proper transforms of $\mathcal{M}_X$ on the varieties U and V, respectively. Then

$$K_U + \lambda_2\mathcal{M}_U \equiv \gamma^*\Big(K_V + \lambda_2\mathcal{M}_V\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i^{\lambda_2}\bar{F}_i + \sum_{i=1}^{s} c_i^{\lambda_2}B_i,$$

where $c_i^{\lambda_2}$ and $d_i^{\lambda_2}$ are rational numbers, and B_i is an δ-exceptional divisor.

Note that $\bar{F}_i$ is not necessary contracted by γ. If $\bar{F}_i$ is not contracted by γ, we have $c_i^{\lambda_2} = 0$.

There is a G_2-invariant divisor R on the surface S such that

$$K_V + \lambda_2\mathcal{M}_V \equiv \iota^*\big(R\big).$$

We have $D \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. Let us identify S with a proper transform of D on the variety V. Then

$$R \equiv K_S + \lambda_2\mathcal{M}_V\Big|_S,$$

and $\mathcal{M}_V|_S$ is a proper transform of the linear system $\mathcal{M}_X|_D$. But

$$\kappa\left(D, \lambda_2\mathcal{M}_X\Big|_D\right) \geqslant 0,$$

because the log pair $(D, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X|_D)$ is canonical and $\lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_1$. Then R is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective.

By Lemmas A.14 and A.15, we have $c_t^{\lambda_2} < 0$ for some $t \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$. But the equality

$$\dim\Big(\iota \circ \gamma\big(\bar{F}_t\big)\Big) = 1$$

holds. Arguing as in the case $\dim(\pi_2(Z_i)) = 1$, we obtain a contradiction. □

Therefore, we see that $H_1 \equiv rF$ for some positive $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, because $\lambda_2 < \lambda_1$. Then

$$K_W + \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_W \equiv \alpha^*\big(rD\big) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^{\lambda_1}F_i,$$

and, for simplicity, we put $a_i = a_i^{\lambda_1}$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Put

$$\mathcal{J} = \left\{P \in \mathbb{P}^1 \;\Big|\; \exists\ i \in \big\{1, \ldots, k\big\} \text{ such that } P \in \pi_1 \circ \alpha\big(F_i\big),\ \pi_1 \circ \alpha\big(F_i\big) \neq \mathbb{P}^1,\ a_i < 0\right\},$$

and let $D_\lambda \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ be a fiber of the morphism π_1 over a point $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Then

$$\alpha^*\big(D_\lambda\big) \equiv \bar{D}_\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i^{\lambda}F_i,$$

where $\bar{D}_\lambda$ is a proper transform of D_λ on the variety W, and $b_i^\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Note that

$$b_i^\lambda \neq 0 \iff \exists\, \lambda \in \mathcal{J} \,\Big|\, \alpha\big(F_i\big) \subset D_\lambda,$$

and $\mathcal{J} \neq \varnothing$ by Corollary 6.5 and Lemmas A.14 and A.15. For every $\lambda \in \mathcal{J}$, put

$$\delta_\lambda = \max\left\{ -\frac{a_i}{b_i^\lambda} \,\Big|\, \alpha\big(F_i\big) \subset D_\lambda,\ a_i < 0 \right\} > 0,$$

and put $\delta_\lambda = 0$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \mathcal{J}$. Then it follows from Definition 2.7 and Corollary 6.5 that

$$\delta_\lambda = -\mathrm{c}^1_{D_\lambda}\big(X, \lambda_1 \mathcal{M}_X, D_\lambda\big).$$

Lemma 6.7. The inequality $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_\lambda \geqslant r$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_\lambda < r$. We have

$$K_W + \lambda_1 \mathcal{M}_W \equiv \alpha^*\left(\Big(r - \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_\lambda\Big) D\right) + \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_\lambda \bar{D}_\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \big(a_i + \delta_\lambda b_i^\lambda\big) F_i,$$

where $a_i + \delta_\lambda b_i^\lambda \geqslant 0$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Then

$$\kappa\big(\bar{X}, \lambda_1 M_{\bar{X}}\big) = \kappa\big(X, \lambda_1 M_X\big) = \kappa\big(W, \lambda_1 M_W\big) = 1,$$

which is impossible, because either $\kappa(\bar{X}, \lambda_1 M_{\bar{X}}) \leqslant 0$, or $\kappa(\bar{X}, \lambda_1 M_{\bar{X}}) = 3$. □

Corollary 6.8. For any set of rational numbers $\{c_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}}$ such that $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} c_\lambda \leqslant r$, one has

$$\mathbb{CS}\left(X, \lambda_1 \mathcal{M}_X - \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} c_\lambda D_\lambda\right) \neq \varnothing.$$

Let $Z \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ be a fiber of π_2, and let $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ be a line in $D \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. Then

$$\mathbb{NE}\big(X\big) = \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0} Z \oplus \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0} C,$$

and $K_X^2 \equiv 9Z + 12C$. Let M_1 and M_2 be general divisors in $\mathcal{M}_X$. Put $T_0 = \lambda_1^2 M_1 \cdot M_2$. Then

$$T_0 = Z_X + \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1} C_\lambda \equiv 9Z + \big(12 + 6r\big) C,$$

where C_λ is an effective cycle whose components are contained in a fiber of π_1 over a point $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1$, and Z_X is an effective cycle such that every component of Z_X does not lie in a fiber of π_1. But

$$12 + 6r \leqslant 12 + 6 \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_\lambda$$

by Lemma 6.7. Let $\beta_\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $C_\lambda \equiv \beta_\lambda C$. Then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \beta_\lambda \leqslant \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1} \beta_\lambda \leqslant 12 + 6r \leqslant 12 + 6 \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{J}} \delta_\lambda,$$

because Z and C generates the cone $\mathbb{NE}(X)$. Let O^1_λ be the G_1-orbit of the point $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{O^1_\lambda \\ \lambda \in \mathcal{J}}} \beta_\lambda \big|O^1_\lambda\big| \leqslant 12 + 6r \leqslant 12 + 6 \sum_{\substack{O^1_\lambda \\ \lambda \in \mathcal{J}}} \delta_\lambda \big|O^1_\lambda\big|,$$

which implies that there is a point $\omega \in \mathbb{P}^1$ such that

$$\beta_\omega \big|O^1_\omega\big| \leqslant 12 + 6\delta_\omega \big|O^1_\omega\big|,$$

where $|O^1_\omega| \geqslant 12$ (see [30]).

Corollary 6.9. There is $t \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\alpha(F_t) \subset D_\omega$ and $\beta_\omega \leqslant 1 - 6a_t/b_t^\omega$, where

$$\frac{a_t}{b_t^\omega} = -\delta_\omega = \min\left\{\frac{a_i}{b_i^\omega}\ \middle|\ \alpha\big(F_i\big) \subset D_\omega,\ a_i < 0\right\} = \mathrm{c}^1_{D_\omega}\big(X, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X, D_\omega\big),$$

the log pair $(X, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X - \delta_\omega D_\omega)$ is canonical along D_ω. But

$$\alpha\big(F_t\big) \in \mathbb{CS}\Big(X, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X + \delta_\omega D_\omega\Big).$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma B.15, we see that

- there are no G_2-invariant curves on $D_\omega \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ of degree 1, 3 and 5,
- there is unique G_2-invariant conic $\Gamma_2 \subset D_\omega \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, which is smooth,
- the action of the group G_2 on the curve $\Gamma_2 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ induces an embedding
$$G_2 \subset \mathrm{Aut}\big(\Gamma_2\big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(2, \mathbb{C}\Big),$$
- every G_2-orbit in $D_\omega \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ consists of at least 6 points,
- every G_2-orbit in Γ_2 consists of at least 12 points (cf. [30]).

Lemma 6.10. The equality $\dim(\alpha(F_t)) = 0$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha(F_t)$ is an irreducible curve. Put $\Lambda = \alpha(F_t)$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_\Lambda\big(\mathcal{M}_X\big) > 1/\lambda_1,$$

and we may assume that Λ is G_2-invariant by swapping F_t with its G_2-orbit.

Let L be a general line in $D_\omega \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. Then

$$3/\lambda_1 = L \cdot \mathcal{M}_X > \frac{L \cdot \Lambda}{\lambda_1},$$

which implies that $\Lambda = \Gamma_2$.

Put $C_\omega = m\Lambda + \Delta$, where Δ is an effective one-cycle such that $\Lambda \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$. Then

$$m \geqslant \begin{cases} 1 + 2\delta_\omega \text{ if } \delta_\omega \leqslant 1/2, \\ 4\delta_\omega \text{ if } \delta_\omega \geqslant 1/2, \end{cases}$$

by Theorem 1.8. But $\beta_\omega \geqslant 2m$ and $\beta_\omega \leqslant 1 + 6\delta_\omega$ by Corollary 6.9. Then

$$1/2 + 3\delta_\omega \geqslant \begin{cases} 1 + 2\delta_\omega \text{ if } \delta_\omega \leqslant 1/2, \\ 4\delta_\omega \text{ if } \delta_\omega \geqslant 1/2, \end{cases}$$

which implies that $\delta_\omega = 1/2$ and $m = 2$, which is impossible by Theorem 1.8. □

Put $P = \alpha(F_t)$. Let $O_P^2 \subset D_\omega \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ be the G_2-orbit of $P \in D_\omega$.

Lemma 6.11. The inequalities $\mathrm{mult}_P(Z_X) \leqslant 3/2$ and $\mathrm{mult}_P(C_\omega) \leqslant \beta_\omega/2$ hold.

Proof. Put $r = |O_P^2|$. Then $r \geqslant 6$. Then

$$9 = \Big(Z_X + \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1} C_\lambda\Big) \cdot D_\omega = Z_X \cdot D_\omega \geqslant \sum_{Q \in O_P^2} \mathrm{mult}_Q\big(Z_X\big) = r\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big) \geqslant 6\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big).$$

which implies that $\mathrm{mult}_P(Z_X) \leqslant 3/2$. Let us show that $\mathrm{mult}_P(C_\omega) \leqslant \beta_\omega/2$.

We may consider C_ω as an effective G_2-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on $\mathbb{P}^2 \cong D_\omega$ of degree β_ω. Then

$$C_\omega = m\Gamma_2 + \Delta,$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\beta_\omega/2 \geqslant m \geqslant 0$, and Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $\Gamma_2 \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$.

Suppose that $P \in \Gamma_2$. Then

$$2\big(\beta_\omega - 2m\big) = \Gamma_2 \cdot \Delta \geqslant \sum_{Q \in O_P} \mathrm{mult}_Q\big(\Delta\big) = r\Big(\mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big) - m\Big) \geqslant r\Big(\mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big) - m\Big),$$

and $r \geqslant 12$ (see [30]). Therefore, we immediately see that

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big) \leqslant \frac{2\beta_\omega + \big(r-4\big)m}{r} \leqslant \frac{2\beta_\omega + \big(r-4\big)\beta_\omega/2}{r} = \frac{\beta_\omega}{2},$$

because $r \geqslant 4$. Thus, to complete the proof we may assume that $P \notin \Gamma_2$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{mult}_P(C_\omega) > \beta_\omega/2$. Then $\mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta) > \beta_\omega/2$, and there is $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(\mu\Delta\big) \geqslant 2$$

and $\mu < 4/\beta_\omega$. In particular, we see that $O_P^2 \subseteq \mathrm{LCS}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mu\Delta)$.

Suppose that there is a G_2-invariant reduced curve $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ such that

$$\mu\Delta = \upsilon\Omega + \Upsilon,$$

where $\upsilon \geqslant 1$, and Υ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, such that $\Omega \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(\Upsilon)$. Then

$$4 > \mu\beta_\omega - 2m\mu = \mu\Delta \cdot H = \big(\upsilon\Omega + \Upsilon\big) \cdot H \geqslant \upsilon\Omega \cdot H \geqslant \Omega \cdot H,$$

where H is a general line on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Then $\Omega = \Gamma_2$, which is a contradiction.

We see that the scheme $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mu\Delta)$ is zero-dimensional, and its support contains O_P^2.

It follows from Theorem 2.14 that the sequence

$$\mathbb{C}^3 \cong H^0\Big(\mathbb{P}^2,\ \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big(1\big)\Big) \longrightarrow H^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{P}^2,\,\mu\Delta)}\Big) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, which implies that $r \leqslant 3$. But $r \geqslant 6$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 6.12. The inequality $\mathrm{mult}_P(\mathcal{M}_X) < (2+\delta_\omega)/\lambda_1$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathrm{mult}_P(\mathcal{M}_X) \geqslant (2+\delta_\omega)/\lambda_1$. Then

$$\frac{\beta_\omega}{2} \geqslant \mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big) \geqslant \lambda_1^2 \mathrm{mult}_P\Big(M_1 \cdot M_2\Big) - \mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big) \geqslant \lambda_1^2 \mathrm{mult}_P^2\big(\mathcal{M}_X\big) - 3/2 \geqslant \delta_\omega^2 + 2\delta_\omega + \frac{5}{2},$$

by Lemma 6.11. But $\beta_\omega \leqslant 1 + 6\delta_\omega$ by Corollary 6.9, which is a contradiction. □

Put $X_0 = X$ and $\Theta_0 = P$. For some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence of blow ups

$$X_N \xrightarrow{\psi_{N,N-1}} X_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\psi_{N-1,N-2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\psi_{3,2}} X_2 \xrightarrow{\psi_{2,1}} X_1 \xrightarrow{\psi_{1,0}} X_0,$$

such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- $\psi_{1,0}$ is a blow up of the point Θ_0,
- $\psi_{i,i-1}$ is a blow up of a point $\Theta_{i-1} \in G_{i-1}$ for every $i \in \{2, \ldots, K\}$, where $G_{i-1} \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ is the exceptional divisor of $\psi_{i-1,i-2}$,
- $\psi_{K+1,K}$ is a blow up of an irreducible curve $\Theta_K \subset G_K \cong \mathbb{P}^2$,
- $\psi_{i,i-1}$ is a blow up of an irreducible curve $\Theta_{i-1} \subset G_{i-1}$ for every $i \in \{K+2, \ldots, N\}$ such that $\psi_{i-1,i-2}(\Theta_{i-1}) = \Theta_{i-1}$, where G_{i-1} is the exceptional divisor of $\psi_{i-1,i-2}$,
- the exceptional divisor G_N and the exceptional divisor F_t induce the same discrete valuation of the field of rational functions of the variety X.

For $N \geqslant j \geqslant i \geqslant 0$, let G_i^j, $\mathcal{M}_{X_j}$, D_ω^j be proper transforms on X_j of G_i, $\mathcal{M}_X$, D_ω, respectively, and let $\psi_{j,i} = \psi_{i+1,i} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{j,j-1}$, where $\psi_{j,j} = \mathrm{id}_{X_j}$. Then

$$K_{X_N} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{M}_{X_N} \equiv \psi_{N,0}^*\big(rD_\omega\big) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i G_i^N,$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $c_N = a_t$. Similarly, we have

$$\psi^*_{N,0}\big(D_\omega\big) \equiv D^N_\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i G^N_i,$$

where $d_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d_N = b^\omega_t$. We have $c_N < 0$ and $\delta_\omega = -c_N/d_N$. We may assume that

$$-\delta_\omega = \frac{a_t}{b^\omega_t} = \frac{c_N}{d_N} < \frac{c_i}{d_i}$$

for $i < N$. A priori, the curve Θ_i may be singular for $i \geqslant K$. But Lemma 6.12 implies that

- the curve Θ_K is a line in $G_K \cong \mathbb{P}^2$,
- for $i > K$, the curve Θ_i is a section of the induced morphism

  $$\psi_{i-1,\,i-2}\Big|_{G_{i-1}} : G_{i-1} \longrightarrow \Theta_{i-2} \cong \mathbb{P}^1,$$

  which implies that $\Theta_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ for $i \geqslant K$.

Let Γ be an oriented graph whose set of vertices consists of the divisors $G_1, \ldots, G_N$ such that

$$\big(G_j, G_i\big) \in \Gamma \iff j > i \text{ and } \Theta_{j-1} \subset G^{j-1}_i \subset X_{j-1},$$

where (G_j, G_i) is the edge that goes from the vertex G_j to the vertex G_i. Let P_i be the number of oriented pathes in Γ that goes from G_N to G_i. Then

$$c_N = \sum_{i=1}^{K} P_i\big(2-\nu_i\big) + \sum_{i=K+1}^{N} P_i\big(1-\nu_i\big),$$

where $\nu_i = \lambda_1 \mathrm{mult}_{P_{i-1}}(\mathcal{M}_{X_{i-1}})$. Note that $(G_i, G_{i-1}) \in \Gamma$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$.

Put $\Sigma_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{K} P_i$ and $\Sigma_1 = \sum_{i=K+1}^{N} P_i$. Then it follows from [25] that the inequality

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big) + \mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big) \geqslant \frac{\big(2\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1 - c_N\big)^2}{\big(\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1\big)\Sigma_0}$$

holds. Put $\Sigma_0' = \sum_{i=1}^{M} P_i$, where $M \leqslant K$ be a biggest natural such that $P_{M-1} \in F^{M-1}_\omega$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big)\Sigma_0 + \mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big)\Sigma_0' \geqslant \frac{\big(2\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1 - c_N\big)^2}{\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1}$$

by [25]. The choice of M implies that $d_N \geqslant \Sigma_0' \leqslant \Sigma_0$. But

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(C_\omega\big) \leqslant \frac{\beta_\omega}{2} \leqslant \frac{1}{2} + 3\delta_\omega = \frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{c_N}{d_N}$$

by Lemma 6.11 and Corollary 6.9. Therefore, we see that

$$\left(\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big) + \frac{1}{2}\right)\Sigma_0 - 3c_N \geqslant \frac{\big(2\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1 - c_N\big)^2}{\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1},$$

where $c_N < 0$ and $\mathrm{mult}_P(Z_X) \leqslant 3/2$. Therefore, we see that

$$2\Sigma_0 - 3c_N \geqslant \frac{\big(2\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1 - c_N\big)^2}{\big(\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1\big)}.$$

Lemma 6.13. The inequality $\mathrm{mult}_P(Z_X) \leqslant 3/4$ holds.

Proof. The log pair $(X, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X)$ is not canonical at the point $P \in D_\omega$. Then the log pair

$$\Big(X,\ \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X + D_\omega\Big)$$

is not log canonical at P. Then $(D_\omega, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X|_{D_\omega})$ is not log canonical at P by Theorem 2.17.

There is $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $0 < \mu < \lambda_1$ and $(D_\omega, \mu\mathcal{M}_X|_{D_\omega})$ is not log canonical at P. Then

$$\mathrm{LCS}\left(D_\omega,\ \mu\mathcal{M}_X\Big|_{D_\omega}\right)$$

is connected by Theorem 2.16. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.11, we see that

- either $\mathcal{L}(D_\omega, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X|_{D_\omega})$ is zero-dimensional,
- or $P \in \Gamma_2$.

If $\mathcal{L}(D_\omega, \lambda_1\mathcal{M}_X|_{D_\omega})$ is zero-dimensional, then $|O_P^2| = 1$ by connectedness. But $|O_P^2| \geqslant 6$.

We see that $P \in \Gamma_2$. Then $|O_P^2| \geqslant 12$ (see [30]). Then

$$9 = \left(Z_X + \sum_{\lambda\in\mathbb{P}^1} C_\lambda\right)\cdot D_\omega = Z_X \cdot D_\omega \geqslant \sum_{Q\in O_P^2} \mathrm{mult}_Q\big(Z_X\big) = \big|O_P^2\big|\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big) \geqslant 12\mathrm{mult}_P\big(Z_X\big),$$

which implies that $\mathrm{mult}_P(Z_X) \leqslant 3/4$. □

Therefore, we see that $c_N < 0$, $\Sigma_0 \geqslant 1$, $\Sigma_1 \geqslant 1$ and

$$\frac{5}{4}\Sigma_0 - 3c_N \geqslant \frac{\big(2\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1 - c_N\big)^2}{\big(\Sigma_0 + \Sigma_1\big)},$$

which is a contradiction. The assertion of Theorem 6.1 is proved.

Appendix A. Non-rationality

Let X be a variety, let $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ be a finite subgroup, let $\pi\colon X \to S$ be a morphism.

Definition A.1. The morphism π is a G-Mori fibration if the following conditions are satisfied:

- the morphism π is G-equivariant,
- the variety X has terminal singularities,
- every G-invariant Weil divisor on X is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor,
- the morphism π is surjective and $\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{O}_S$,
- the divisor $-K_X$ is relatively ample for π,
- the inequality $\dim(S) < \dim(X)$ holds and

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\mathrm{Pic}^G\Big(X/S\Big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\right) = 1.$$

Suppose that $\pi\colon X \to S$ is a G-Mori fibration. It follows from [33] and [15] that

the variety S is rationally connected $\iff$ the variety X is rationally connected.

Remark A.2. The group G naturally acts on the variety S. However, this action is not necessary faithful. One can show that every G-invariant Weil divisor on S is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor (see [18]).

Suppose, in addition, that X is rationally connected. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G(X)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G(S)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big) + 1.$$

Definition A.3. The fibration π is G-birationally rigid if, given any G-equivariant birational map $\xi\colon X \dashrightarrow X'$ to a G-Mori fibration $\pi'\colon X' \to S'$, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\rho"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & X \arrow[r, dashed, "\xi"] & X' \arrow[d, "\pi'"] \\
S \arrow[rr, dashed, "\sigma"] & & S',
\end{tikzcd}$$

where σ is a birational map, and $\rho \in \mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ such that the rational $\xi\circ\rho$ induces an isomorphism of the generic fibers of the G-Mori fibrations π and π'.

Definition A.4. The fibration π is G-birationally superrigid if, given any G-equivariant birational map $\xi\colon X \dashrightarrow X'$ to a G-Mori fibration $\pi'\colon X' \to S'$, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\xi"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & X' \arrow[d, "\pi'"] \\
S \arrow[r, dashed, "\sigma"'] & S',
\end{tikzcd}$$

where σ is a birational map, and ξ induces an isomorphism of the generic fibers of π and π'.

We say that X is G-birationally rigid (G-birationally superrigid, respectively) if $\dim(S) = 0$ and $\pi\colon X \to S$ is G-birationally rigid (G-birationally superrigid, respectively).

Remark A.5. Suppose that $\dim(S) = 0$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- the Fano variety X is G-birationally superrigid,
- the Fano variety X is G-birationally rigid and $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X) = \mathrm{Aut}^G(X)$.

We say that $\pi\colon X \to S$ is birationally rigid (birationally superrigid, respectively) if $\pi\colon X \to S$ is G-birationally rigid (G-birationally superrigid, respectively), where G is a trivial group.

Example A.6. It follows from [25] that $\pi\colon X \to S$ is birationally rigid if

- the equalities $\dim(X) = 3$ and $\dim(S) = 1$ hold,
- the inequality $K_X^2 \cdot F \leqslant 2$ holds, where F is a general fiber of π,
- the threefold X is smooth and
$$K_X^2 \notin \mathrm{Int}\Big(\overline{\mathbb{NE}}(X)\Big),$$
where $\mathrm{Int}(\overline{\mathbb{NE}}(X))$ is an interior of the closure of the cone of effective one-cycles.

We say that X is birationally rigid (birationally superrigid, respectively) if $\dim(S) = 0$ and the fibration $\pi\colon X \to S$ is birationally rigid (birationally superrigid, respectively).

Example A.7. General hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^n$ of degree $n \geqslant 4$ is birationally superrigid by [24].

It follows from Definition A.3 that if the G-Mori fibration $\pi\colon X \to S$ is G-birationally rigid and $X \not\cong \mathbb{P}^n$, then there is no G-equivariant birational map $X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$, where $n = \dim(X)$.

Definition A.8. We say that the G-Mori fibration $\pi\colon X \to S$ is square birationally equivalent to a G-Mori fibration $\pi'\colon X' \to S'$ if there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\xi"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & X' \arrow[d, "\pi'"] \\
S \arrow[r, dashed, "\sigma"'] & S',
\end{tikzcd}$$

where σ is a birational map, and ξ is a G-equivariant birational map such that the map ξ induces an isomorphism of the generic fibers of the G-Mori fibrations $\pi\colon X \to S$ and $\pi'\colon X' \to S'$.

The following definition is due to [11].

Definition A.9. Let V be a variety, and let $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Aut}(V)$ be a finite subgroup. The set

$$\mathcal{P}\big(V,\ G\big) = \Big\{\text{a } G\text{-Mori fibration } \tau\colon Y \longrightarrow T \ \Big|\ \exists \text{ a } G\text{-equivariant birational map } Y \dashrightarrow V\Big\}\Big/\bigstar$$

is a G-pliability of the variety V, where $\bigstar$ is a square birational equivalence.

We put $\mathcal{P}(V) = \mathcal{P}(V, G)$ if the group G is trivial. The following conditions are equivalent:

- the fibration $\pi\colon X \to S$ is G-birationally rigid,
- the set $\mathcal{P}(X, G)$ consists of the fibration $\pi\colon X \to S$,
- the equality $|\mathcal{P}(X, G)| = 1$ holds.

Remark A.10. In the notation and assumption of Definition A.9, it follows from [2] that

$$\mathcal{P}\big(V,\ \Gamma\big) \neq \varnothing \iff -K_V \text{ is not pseudoeffective} \iff V \text{ is uniruled.}$$

Example A.11. Let X be a sufficiently general quartic in $\mathbb{P}^4$ that is given by

$$w^2x^2 + wyz + xg_3(y, z, t, w) + g_4(y, z, t, w) = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \cong \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t, w]\Big),$$

where g_i is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i. Then $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2$ by [11].

Let $\bar{\pi}\colon \bar{X} \to \bar{S}$ be a G-Mori fibration, let $\nu\colon \bar{X} \dashrightarrow X$ be a G-equivariant birational map. Put

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}} = \Big|\bar{\pi}^*\big(D\big)\Big|$$

for a very ample divisor D on the variety $\bar{S}$ in the case when $\dim(\bar{S}) \neq 0$, and put

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}} = \Big| - mK_{\bar{X}}\Big|$$

for a sufficiently big and divisible $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in the case when $\dim(\bar{S}) = 0$. Put $\mathcal{M}_X = \nu(\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}})$.

Lemma A.12. Suppose that $\dim(\bar{S}) \neq 0$. Then either there is a commutative diagram

(A.13)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{X} \arrow[r, dashed, "\nu"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\pi}"'] & X \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
\bar{S} & S, \arrow[l, dashed, "\zeta"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ζ is a rational dominant map, or there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X + \lambda\mathcal{M}_X \equiv \pi^*\big(H\big),$$

where H is a G-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety S such that

- either the log pair $(X, \lambda\mathcal{M}_X)$ is not canonical,
- or the divisor H is not $\mathbb{Q}$-effective.

Proof. The diagram A.13 exists $\iff$ $\mathcal{M}_X$ lies in the fibers of π.

We may assume that $\mathcal{M}_X$ does not lie in the fibers of π. Then there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X + \lambda\mathcal{M}_X \equiv \pi^*\big(H\big),$$

where H is a G-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety S. By Lemma 2.24, we have

$$\kappa\Big(K_X + \lambda\mathcal{M}_X\Big) = -\infty,$$

but $\kappa(K_X + \lambda\mathcal{M}_X) = 0$ if $(X, \lambda\mathcal{M}_X)$ is canonical and H is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective (see Corollary 2.25). $\square$

Let ϵ be a positive rational number. There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& W \arrow[ld, "\alpha"'] \arrow[rd, "\beta"] & \\
X & & \bar{X}, \arrow[ll, dashed, "\nu"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where α and β are G-equivariant birational morphisms, and W is a smooth variety.

Let $\mathcal{M}_W$ be a proper transform of the linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}$ on the variety W. Then

$$\alpha^*\Big(K_X+\epsilon\mathcal{M}_X\Big)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^{\epsilon}F_i\equiv K_W+\epsilon\mathcal{M}_W\equiv\beta^*\Big(K_{\bar{X}}+\epsilon\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}\Big)+\sum_{i=1}^{r}b_i^{\epsilon}E_i,$$

where a_i^{ϵ} is a rational number, b_i^{ϵ} is a positive rational number, F_i is a G-orbit of an exceptional prime divisor of the morphism α, and E_i is a G-orbit of an exceptional prime divisor of β.

Lemma A.14. Suppose that $\dim(\bar{S})\neq 0$. Then either there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{X} \arrow[r, dashed, "\nu"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & X \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
\bar{S} & S, \arrow[l, dashed, "\zeta"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ζ is a rational dominant map, or there is $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X+\lambda\mathcal{M}_X\equiv\pi^*\big(H\big),$$

where H is a G-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety S such that

- either there is $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$ such that $a_i^{\lambda}<0$ and F_i is not β-exceptional,
- or the divisor H is not $\mathbb{Q}$-effective.

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma A.12, we may assume that there is $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X+\lambda\mathcal{M}_X\equiv\pi^*\big(H\big),$$

where H is a G-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety S.

Suppose that H is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective, and $a_i^{\lambda}\geqslant 0$ for every i such that F_i is not β-exceptional. Then

$$\beta\left(\big(\pi\circ\alpha\big)^*\big(H\big)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^{\lambda}F_i\right)\equiv\beta\left(\big(\pi\circ\alpha\big)^*\big(H\big)+\sum_{a_i^{\lambda}\geqslant 0}a_i^{\lambda}F_i\right)\equiv K_{\bar{X}}+\lambda\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}},$$

which implies that $K_{\bar{X}}+\lambda\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective, which is a contradiction. □

The assertion of Lemma A.14 is an analogue of [26, Proposition 2].

Lemma A.15. Suppose that $\dim(\bar{S})=0$. Then there is $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X+\lambda\mathcal{M}_X\equiv\pi^*\big(H\big),$$

where H is a G-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety S. Then

- either $\dim(S)=0$ and ν is an isomorphism,
- or there is $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$ such that $a_i^{\lambda}<0$ and F_i is not β-exceptional,
- or the divisor H is not $\mathbb{Q}$-effective.

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}=|-mK_{\bar{X}}|$, where m is a sufficiently big and sufficiently divisible natural number m. Then $\mathcal{M}_X$ does not lie in the fibers of π. Then there is $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X+\lambda\mathcal{M}_X\equiv\pi^*\big(H\big),$$

where H is a G-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety S. Then

$$\dim\big(S\big)\geqslant\kappa\Big(X,\ \lambda\mathcal{M}_X\Big)=\kappa\Big(\bar{X},\ \lambda\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}\Big)=\begin{cases}\dim(\bar{X})\text{ if }\lambda>1/m,\\ 0\text{ if }\lambda=1/m,\\ -\infty\text{ if }\mu<1/m,\end{cases}$$

by Lemma 2.24. Therefore, we see that $\lambda\leqslant 1/m$.

Suppose that H is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective, and $a_i^\lambda\geqslant 0$ for every i such that F_i is not β-exceptional. Then

$$\beta\left((\pi\circ\alpha)^*\big(H\big)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^\lambda F_i\right)\equiv\beta\left((\pi\circ\alpha)^*\big(H\big)+\sum_{a_i^\lambda\geqslant 0}a_i^\lambda F_i\right)\equiv K_{\bar{X}}+\lambda\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}},$$

which implies that $K_{\bar{X}}+\lambda\mathcal{M}_{\bar{X}}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-effective. Then $\lambda=1/m$. Thus, we see that

$$\big(\pi\circ\alpha\big)^*\big(H\big)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^\lambda F_i\equiv\sum_{i=1}^{r}b_i^\lambda E_i.$$

Suppose that $\dim(S)=0$. Then it follows from [19, Lemma 2.19] that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^\lambda F_i=\sum_{i=1}^{r}b_i^\lambda E_i,$$

which implies that $(X,\lambda\mathcal{M}_X)$ is terminal. Then ν is an isomorphism by Theorem 2.28.

To complete the proof, we may assume that $\dim(S)\neq 0$. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(\bar{S}\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big)+1+k=\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(X\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big)+k=\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(W\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big)=1+r,$$

which implies that $k\leqslant r-1$. For every $i\in\{1,\dots,r\}$, we see that

- either E_i is an exceptional divisor of the morphism α,
- or $\alpha(E_i)$ is a divisor that lies in the fibers of the morphism π.

Suppose that F_1 is not contracted by β. Then

$$\Big\langle F_1,E_1,\dots,E_r\Big\rangle=\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(W\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q},$$

where $\langle F_1,E_1,\dots,E_r\rangle$ is a linear span of the divisors $F_1,E_1,\dots,E_r$. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\Big\langle E_1,\dots,E_r\Big\rangle\bigcap\Big\langle F_1,\dots,F_k\Big\rangle\right)=k-1,$$

because $F_1,\dots,F_k$ are linearly independent in $\mathrm{Pic}^G(\bar{W})\otimes\mathbb{Q}$. Thus, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\Big\langle\alpha\big(E_1\big),\dots,\alpha\big(E_r\big)\Big\rangle\right)=r-k+1=\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(X\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big),$$

where we assume that $\alpha(E_i)=0$ if the divisor E_i is contracted by α. But

$$\Big\langle\alpha\big(E_1\big),\dots,\alpha\big(E_r\big)\Big\rangle\neq\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(X\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q},$$

because $\alpha(E_i)$ lies in the fibers of π if E_i is not contracted by α.

We see that F_1 is contracted by β. Similarly, we see that all $F_1,\dots,F_k$ are contracted by β.

Without loss of generality we may assume that $F_i=E_i$ for every $i\in\{1,\dots,k\}$. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\Big\langle\alpha\big(E_{k+1}\big),\dots,\alpha\big(E_r\big)\Big\rangle\right)=r-k=\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\mathrm{Pic}^G\big(S\big)\otimes\mathbb{Q}\Big),$$

and all divisors $\alpha(E_{k+1}),\dots,\alpha(E_r)$ lies in the fibers of π.

Let M be a general very ample divisor on S, and let N be its proper transform on W. Then

$$\pi^*(M)\in\Big\langle\alpha(E_{k+1}),\ldots,\alpha(E_r)\Big\rangle,$$

and $N\sim(\pi\circ\alpha)^*(M)$. The divisor N is not contracted by β. But

$$\big(\pi\circ\alpha\big)^*(M)\in\Big\langle E_1,\ldots,E_r\Big\rangle,$$

which is a contradiction. The obtained contradiction completes the proof. ☐

Suppose, in addition, that $\dim(S)=0$.

Theorem A.16. The following conditions are equivalent:

- the Fano variety X is G-birationally rigid,
- for every G-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety X that has no fixed components, there is a G-equivariant birational automorphism $\xi\in\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ such that
  $$\Big(X,\lambda\,\xi(\mathcal{M})\Big)$$
  has canonical singularities, where $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $K_X+\lambda\,\xi(\mathcal{M})\equiv 0$.

Proof. See [8, Theorem 1.26] (cf. Lemma A.14 and A.15). ☐

Corollary A.17. The following conditions are equivalent:

- the Fano variety X is G-birationally rigid,
- for every G-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety X that has no fixed components, there is a G-equivariant birational automorphism $\xi\in\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ such that
  $$\kappa\Big(X,\ \lambda\,\xi(\mathcal{M})\Big)\geqslant 0,$$
  where $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $K_X+\lambda\,\xi(\mathcal{M})\equiv 0$.

Corollary A.18. The following conditions are equivalent:

- the Fano variety X is G-birationally superrigid,
- for every G-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on X that has no fixed components, the log pair
  $$\Big(X,\ \lambda\,\mathcal{M}\Big)$$
  has canonical singularities, where $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $K_X+\lambda\,\mathcal{M}\equiv 0$.

Let us show how to apply Corollary A.18.

Lemma A.19. Suppose that X is a smooth del Pezzo surface such that

$$\big|\Sigma\big|\geqslant K_X^2$$

for any G-orbit $\Sigma\subset X$. Then X is G-birationally superrigid.

Proof. Suppose that X is not G-birationally superrigid. Then it follows from Corollary A.18 that there is a G-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the surface X such that $\mathcal{M}$ does not have fixed curves, but the log pair $(X,\lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical at some point $O\in X$, where $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X+\lambda\mathcal{M}\equiv 0.$$

Let Σ be the G-orbit of the point O. Then $\mathrm{mult}_P(\mathcal{M})>1/\lambda$ for every point $P\in\Sigma$. Then

$$\frac{K_X^2}{\lambda^2}=M_1\cdot M_2\geqslant\sum_{P\in\Sigma}\mathrm{mult}_P\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big)\geqslant\sum_{P\in\Sigma}\mathrm{mult}_P^2\big(\mathcal{M}\big)>\frac{|\Sigma|}{\lambda^2}\geqslant\frac{K_X^2}{\lambda^2},$$

where M_1 and M_2 are sufficiently general curves in $\mathcal{M}$. ☐

Let us show how to apply Lemma A.19.

Theorem A.20. Let G be a finite subgroup in

$$\mathrm{Aut}\big(\mathbb{P}^2\big)\cong\mathbb{PGL}\Big(3,\mathbb{C}\Big)$$

such that $G\cong\mathbb{A}_6$. Then $\mathbb{P}^2$ is G-birationally superrigid.

Proof. Let $\Sigma\subset\mathbb{P}^2$ be any G-orbit. Then it follows from [32] that

$$\big|\Sigma\big|\geqslant 12,$$

which implies that $\mathbb{P}^2$ is G-birationally superrigid by Lemma A.19. ☐

Let Γ be a subset in $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$.

Definition A.21. The subset Γ untwists all G-maximal singularities if for every G-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety X that has no fixed components, there is a $\xi\in\Gamma$ such that the pair

$$\Big(X,\ \lambda\xi\big(\mathcal{M}\big)\Big)$$

has canonical singularities, where λ is a rational number such that $K_X+\lambda\xi(\mathcal{M})\equiv 0$.

Applying Lemma A.14 and A.15, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary A.22. Suppose that Γ untwists all G-maximal singularities. Then

- the variety X is G-birationally rigid,
- the group $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ is generated by Γ and $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X)$.

It follows from Theorem A.16 that the following conditions are equivalent:

- the variety X is G-birationally rigid,
- the group $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ untwists all G-maximal singularities.

Definition A.23. Global G-invariant log canonical threshold of the variety X is the number

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X,G\big)=\sup\left\{\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}\ \left|\ \begin{array}{l}\text{the log pair }\ (X,\lambda D)\ \text{ has log canonical singularities}\\ \text{for every } G\text{-invariant effective } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisor } D\equiv -K_X\end{array}\right.\right\}\geqslant 0.$$

Let us show how to compute the number $\mathrm{lct}(X,G)$ (see [5, Lemma 5.7]).

Theorem A.24. Let X be a smooth del Pezzo surface such that $K_X^2=5$. Then

$$\mathrm{Aut}\big(X\big)\cong\mathbb{S}_5,$$

the surface X is $\mathbb{A}_5$-birationally superrigid, and $\mathrm{lct}(X,\mathbb{A}_5)=2$, where $\mathrm{Pic}^{\mathbb{A}_5}(X)\cong\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. The isomorphisms $\mathrm{Aut}(X)\cong\mathbb{S}_5$ and $\mathrm{Pic}^{\mathbb{A}_5}(X)\cong\mathbb{Z}$ are well-known (see [27], [13]).

Let $\Sigma\subset X$ be any $\mathbb{A}_5$-orbit. Suppose that $|\Sigma|\leqslant 6$. Then $|\Sigma|\geqslant 5$, because $\mathbb{A}_5$ is simple.

Let $P\in\Sigma$ be a point, let $H\subset\mathbb{A}_5$ be the stabilizer of the point P. Then

$$\big|H\big|=\frac{|\mathbb{A}_5|}{|\Sigma|}=\frac{60}{|\Sigma|},$$

and H acts faithfully on the tangent space of the surface X at the point P. Then

$$\big|\Sigma\big|\neq 5,$$

because $\mathbb{A}_4$ does not have faithful two-dimensional representations.

We see that $|\Sigma|=6$. In particular, the surface X is G-birationally superrigid by Lemma A.19, which also follows from either from [3] or [1].

The surface X contains 10 smooth rational curves $L_1,L_2,\ldots,L_{10}$ such that

$$L_1\cdot L_1=L_2\cdot L_2=\cdots=L_{10}\cdot L_{10}=-1,$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^{10}L_i\sim -2K_X$. Then $\mathrm{lct}(X,\mathbb{A}_5)\leqslant 2$, because the divisor $\sum_{i=1}^{10}L_i$ is $\mathbb{A}_5$-invariant.

It follows from [14] that there is a birational morphism $\chi\colon X\to\mathbb{P}^2$ that is a blow up of the four singular points of the curve $W\subset\mathbb{P}^2$ that is given by the equation

$$x^6+y^6+z^6+\Big(x^2+y^2+z^2\Big)\Big(x^4+y^4+z^4\Big)=12x^2y^2z^2\subset\mathbb{P}^2\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}[x,y,z]\Big).$$

Let Z be the proper transform on X of the curve W. Then

$$Z\sim -2K_X,$$

and the curves Z and $\sum_{i=1}^{10}L_i$ are the only $\mathbb{S}_5$-invariant curves in $|-2K_X|$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the pencil on X that is generated by the curves Z and $\sum_{i=1}^{10}L_i$. Then every curve in the pencil $\mathcal{P}$ is $\mathbb{A}_5$-invariant (see [14]).

Let T be a curve in $\mathcal{P}$ such that $\Sigma\cap T\neq\varnothing$. Then

$$\Sigma\subset\mathrm{Sing}\big(T\big),$$

because H is not abelian and, hence, does not have faithful one-dimensional representations.

It follows from [14] that $\mathcal{P}$ contains five singular curves, which are

- the curve $\sum_{i=1}^{10}L_i$,
- two irreducible rational curves R_1 and R_2 that have 6 nodes,
- two reduced curves F_1 and F_2 each consisting of 5 smooth rational curves.

Therefore, we see that $\Sigma=\mathrm{Sing}(R_1)$ or $\Sigma=\mathrm{Sing}(R_2)$.

The representation induced by the action of $\mathbb{A}_5$ on $|-K_X|$ is a sum of two non-equivalent irreducible three-dimensional representations of $\mathbb{A}_5$ (see [27]), which induces two $\mathbb{A}_5$-equivariant projections $\phi\colon X\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^2$ and $\psi\colon X\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^2$, respectively. It follows from [27] that

- the maps ϕ and ψ are are morphisms of degree 5,
- the actions of $\mathbb{A}_5$ on $\mathbb{P}^2$ induced by ϕ and ψ are induced by non-equivalent irreducible three-dimensional representations of $\mathbb{A}_5$ (cf. the proof of Lemma B.15), respectively.

Suppose that $\mathrm{lct}(X,\mathbb{A}_5)\neq 2$. There is an effective $\mathbb{A}_5$-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on X such that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(X,\lambda D\Big)\neq\varnothing$$

and $D\equiv -K_X$, where λ is a positive rational number such that $\lambda<2$. Then

$$H^1\Bigg(X,\ \mathcal{O}_X\Big(-K_X\Big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big(X,\lambda D\Big)\Bigg)=0 \tag{A.25}$$

by Theorem 2.14, where $\mathcal{I}(X,\lambda D)$ is the multiplier ideal sheaf (see Definition 2.13).

Suppose that there is a $\mathbb{A}_5$-invariant reduced curve C on the surface X such that

$$\lambda D=\mu C+\Omega,$$

where μ is a positive rational number such that $\mu\geqslant 1$, and Ω is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the surface X, whose support does not contain any component of the curve C. Then

$$C\sim -mK_X,$$

where m is a natural number. Therefore, we have

$$5=-K_X\cdot D\geqslant\frac{5\mu}{\lambda}>\frac{5m}{2},$$

which is implies that $m=1$. But the equality $m=1$ is impossible.

Therefore, we see that $\mathbb{LCS}(X,\lambda D)$ does not contain curves (see Definition 2.10).

It follows from the vanishing A.25 that

$$\Big|\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X,\lambda D\Big)\Big|\leqslant 6,$$

but the set $\mathrm{LCS}(X,\lambda D)$ is $\mathbb{A}_5$-invariant. Then $|\mathrm{LCS}(X,\lambda D)|=6$.

Thus, we see that either $\mathrm{LCS}(X,\lambda D)=\mathrm{Sing}(R_1)$ or $\mathrm{LCS}(X,\lambda D)=\mathrm{Sing}(R_2)$.

We may assume that $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$ does not contain R_1 and R_2 by Remark 2.6.

We may assume that $\mathrm{LCS}(X,\lambda D)=\mathrm{Sing}(R_1)=\Sigma$. Put

$$\mathrm{Sing}\big(R_1\big)=\Big\{O_1,O_2,O_3,O_4,O_5,O_6\Big\},$$

where O_i is a singular point of the curve R_1. We may assume that $P=O_1$. Then

$$10=R_1\cdot D\geqslant\sum_{i=1}^{6}\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}\big(D\big)\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}\big(R_1\big)\geqslant 12\mathrm{mult}_P\big(D\big).$$

which implies that $\mathrm{mult}_P(D)\leqslant 5/6$.

Let $\pi\colon U\to X$ be a blow up of the points O_1,O_2,O_3,O_4,O_5,O_6. Then

$$K_U+\lambda\bar{D}+\sum_{i=1}^{6}\Big(\lambda\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}\big(D\big)-1\Big)E_i\equiv\pi^*\Big(K_X+\lambda D\Big),$$

where E_i is the exceptional curve of the blow up π such that $\pi(E_i)=O_i$, and $\bar{D}$ is the proper transform of the divisor D on the surface U. Then the log pair

$$\left(U,\lambda\bar{D}+\sum_{i=1}^{6}\Big(\lambda\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}\big(D\big)-1\Big)E_i\right)$$

is not log canonical at some point $Q\in E_1$. Then it follows from Theorem 2.16 that

$$\mathrm{LCS}\left(U,\lambda\bar{D}+\sum_{i=1}^{6}\Big(\lambda\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}\big(D\big)-1\Big)E_i\right)\bigcap E_1=Q,$$

which is impossible, because the $\mathbb{A}_5$-orbit of the point Q contains at least 2 points of the exceptional curve E_1, because H acts faithfully on the tangent space of X at the point P. □

The number $\mathrm{lct}(X,G)$ plays an important role in geometry (see Theorem 5.1). We put

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X\big)=\mathrm{lct}\big(X,G\big)$$

if the group G is trivial. Then $\mathrm{lct}(\mathbb{P}^n)=1/(n+1)$ (see [8]).

Example A.26. Let X be a general hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^n$ of degree $n\geqslant 6$. Then $\mathrm{lct}(X)=1$ by [26].

Note that Definition A.3 still make sense if X is defined over a perfect field.

Definition A.27. The variety X is said to be universally G-birationally rigid if the variety

$$X\otimes\mathrm{Spec}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big(U\big)\Big)$$

is G-birationally rigid for any variety U, where $\mathbb{C}(U)$ is the field of rational functions of the variety U, and we identify G with a subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Aut}(X\otimes\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}(U)))$.

It follows from Definition A.4 that if the variety X is G-birationally superrigid, then

- the variety X is universally G-birationally rigid,
- for any variety U, the variety

  $$X\otimes\mathrm{Spec}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big(U\big)\Big)$$

  is G-birationally superrigid, where $\mathbb{C}(U)$ is the field of rational functions of the variety U, and we identify G with a subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Aut}(X\otimes\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}(U)))$.

Remark A.28. Suppose that $\dim(X)\neq 1$ and X is G-birationally rigid. Then

- the group $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X)$ is finite (see [28]),
- the variety X is universally G-birationally rigid if $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X)$ is countable (see [21]).

Take $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r \geqslant 2$. For every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, let X_i be a Fano variety, and let G_i be a finite subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(X_i)$ such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\Bigg(\mathrm{Pic}^{G_i}\big(X_i\big) \otimes \mathbb{Q}\Bigg) = 1,$$

and every G_i-invariant Weil divisor on the variety X_i is a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor. Suppose, in addition, that X_i has at most terminal singularities, and the variety X_i is G_i-birationally rigid. Put

- $\mathcal{X} = X_1 \times X_2 \times \cdots \times X_r$ and $\mathcal{G} = G_1 \times G_2 \times \cdots \times G_r$,
- $\mathcal{S}_1 = X_2 \times \cdots \times X_r$ and $\mathcal{S}_r = X_1 \times \cdots \times X_r$,
- $\mathcal{S}_i = X_1 \times \cdots \times X_{i-1} \times X_{i+1} \times \cdots \times X_r$ for every $i \in \{2, \dots, r-1\}$.

Let $\pi_i\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{S}_i$ be a natural projection. Then π_i is a $\mathcal{G}$-Mori fibration and

$$\big\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r\big\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G}\big),$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ is the $\mathcal{G}$-pliability of the variety $\mathcal{X}$ (see Definition A.9).

Theorem A.29. For every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, suppose that X_i is universally G_i-birationally rigid and the inequality $\mathrm{lct}(X_i, G_i) \geqslant 1$ holds. Then $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G}) = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r\}$.

Proof. Suppose that there is a $\mathcal{G}$-Mori fibration $\bar{\pi}\colon \bar{X} \to \bar{S}$ such that there is a $\mathcal{G}$-equivariant birational map $\nu\colon \bar{X} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. We must show that there is $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ such that $\dim(\bar{S}) \neq 0$, and there exists a commutative diagram

(A.30)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{X} \arrow[r, dashed, "\nu"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\pi}"'] & \mathcal{X} \arrow[r, dashed, "\rho"] & \mathcal{X} \arrow[d, "\pi_i"] \\
\bar{S} \arrow[rr, dashed, "\sigma"] & & \mathcal{S}_i,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ρ is a $\mathcal{G}$-equivariant birational automorphism, and σ is a birational map.

Arguing as in the proof of [26, Theorem 1] and [6, Theorem 6.5] and using Lemma A.15 instead of using [26, Proposition 2], we see that $\dim(\bar{S}) \neq 0$ (cf. the proof of Theorem 6.1).

Arguing as in the proof of [26, Theorem 1] and [6, Theorem 6.5] and using Lemma A.14 instead of using [26, Proposition 2], we obtain the existence of the commutative diagram A.30. ☐

Let us show how to apply Theorem A.29 (cf. Examples A.7 and A.26).

Example A.31. The simple group $\mathbb{A}_6$ is a group of automorphisms of the sextic

$$10x^3y^3 + 9zx^5 + 9zy^5 + 27z^6 = 45x^2y^2z^2 + 135xyz^4 \subset \mathbb{P}^2 \cong \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x, y, z\big]\Big),$$

which induces a monomorphism $\mathbb{A}_6 \times \mathbb{A}_6 \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2)$, which induces a monomorphism

$$\phi\colon \mathbb{A}_6 \times \mathbb{A}_6 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Bir}\big(\mathbb{P}^4\big),$$

because the variety $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ is rational. Then it immediately follows from Theorem A.29 that the subroup $\phi(\mathbb{A}_6 \times \mathbb{A}_6)$ is not conjugate to any subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^4)$, because

- the surface $\mathbb{P}^2$ is $\mathbb{A}_6$-birationally superrigid by Theorem A.20,
- the equality $\mathrm{lct}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathbb{A}_6) = 2$ holds (see [5]).

For further applications of Theorem A.29 see [26] and [6].

Appendix B. Cremona group

Let G be a finite group. Put $\mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C}) = \mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^2)$. Let $\phi\colon G \to \mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$ be a monomorphism.

Problem B.1. Up to conjugations, find all subgroups in $\mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$ that are isomorphic to G.

The purpose of this section is to solve Problem B.1 in the case when

$$G \in \Big\{\mathbb{A}_5, \mathbb{A}_6, \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big)\Big\},$$

which solves Problem B.1 for all simple non-abelian subgroups in $\mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$ (see Theorem B.7).

Theorem B.2. Up to conjugations, the group $\mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$ contains 3, 1, 2 subgroups somorphic to

$$\mathbb{A}_5, \mathbb{A}_6, \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big),$$

respectively. The description of this subgroups follows Theorems B.8, B.10, B.12.

Proof. The required assertion (probably known) follows from Theorems B.8, B.10, B.12. □

Let $\phi'\colon G \to \mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$ be a monomorphism. If $\phi(G) = \phi'(G)$, then $\phi' = \phi\circ\chi$, where $\chi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$.

Definition B.3. We say that the pairs (G, ϕ) and (G, ϕ') are conjugate if there exists a birational automorphism $\epsilon \in \mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$ such that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & G \arrow[dl, "\phi"'] \arrow[dr, "\phi'"] & \\
\mathrm{Bir}\big(\mathbb{P}^2\big) \arrow[rr, "\omega_\epsilon"'] & & \mathrm{Bir}\big(\mathbb{P}^2\big),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ω_ϵ is an inner isomorphism such that $\omega_\epsilon(g) = \epsilon \circ g \circ \epsilon^{-1}$ for every $g \in \mathrm{Cr}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

If $\phi' = \phi \circ \chi$ for some inner isomorphism $\chi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, then (G, ϕ) and (G, ϕ') are conjugate.

Problem B.4. For every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, decide whether (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi\circ\sigma)$ are conjugate or not.

It follows from [13, Lemma 3.5] that we can find a smooth rational surface X, a monomorphism $\upsilon\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X)$, and a birational map $\xi\colon X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ such that

$$\phi\big(g\big) = \xi \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \xi^{-1} \in \mathrm{Bir}\big(\mathbb{P}^2\big)$$

for every element $g \in G$. The triple (X, ξ, υ) is not uniquely defined by the pair (G, ϕ).

Definition B.5. We say that the triple (X, ξ, υ) is a regularization of the pair (G, ϕ).

Let (X', ξ', υ') be a regularization of the pair (G, ϕ').

Theorem B.6. The following assertions are equivalent:

- the pairs (G, ϕ) and (G, ϕ') are conjugate,
- there is a birational map $\rho\colon X \dashrightarrow X'$ such that
  $$\upsilon'\big(g\big) = \rho \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \rho^{-1} \in \mathrm{Aut}\big(X'\big)$$
  for every element $g \in G$.

Proof. See [13, Lemma 3.4]. □

It follows from Theorem B.6 that, to solve Problems B.1 and B.4, we may assume that there is a morphism $\pi\colon X \to S$ that is a $\upsilon(G)$-Mori fibration. Then either $S \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ or S is a point.

Theorem B.7. Suppose that G be a simple nonabelian group. Then

$$G \in \Big\{\mathbb{A}_5, \mathbb{A}_6, \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big)\Big\}.$$

Proof. The required assertion follows from [13]. Indeed, suppose that $S \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Then

$$G \subset \mathrm{Aut}\big(\mathbb{P}^1\big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(2, \mathbb{C}\Big),$$

because $\upsilon(G)$ acts nontrivially either on the fiber of π or on $\pi(X) \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Then $G \cong \mathbb{A}_5$ (see [30]).

We may assume that S is a point. Then either $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ or $K_X^2 \in \{2, 5\}$ (see [13]).

In the case when $K_X^2 = 5$, we have $\mathrm{Aut}(X) \cong \mathbb{S}_5$ and $G \cong \mathbb{A}_5$ (see [13]). Similarly, we have

$$G \cong \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big)$$

in the case when $K_X^2 = 2$ (see [13]). In the case when $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, it is well-known (see [13]) that

$$G \in \Big\{\mathbb{A}_5, \mathbb{A}_6, \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big)\Big\},$$

which completes the proof. □

Let us identify the subgroup $\upsilon(G) \subset \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ with the group G.

Theorem B.8. Suppose that $G \cong \mathbb{PSL}(2, \mathbb{F}_7)$. Then

- the variety S is a point,
- the surface X is G-birationally superrigid,
- one of the following two possibilities holds:
  - $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, and G is conjugate to a subgroup that leaves invariant the curve

$$x^3y + y^3z + z^3x = 0 \subset \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x, y, z\big]\Big) \cong \mathbb{P}^2, \tag{B.9}$$

  - X is a double cover of $\mathbb{P}^2$ branched along the curve B.9,
- for every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, the following conditions are equivalent:
  - the pairs (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi \circ \sigma)$ are conjugate,
  - the isomorphism σ is an inner isomorphism.

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem B.7, we see that

- the variety S is a point,
- one of the following two possibilities holds:
  - $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, and G is conjugate to a subgroup that leaves invariant the curve B.9,
  - X is a double cover of $\mathbb{P}^2$ branched along the curve B.9.

Any G-orbit in X consists of least 2 points. Indeed, the group G is simple, which implies that

- the group G does not have faithful two-dimensional representations,
- the group G does not have subgroups of index two.

If $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, then any G-orbit in X contains at least 12 points (see [30] or [32]).

It follows from Lemma A.19 that X is G-birationally superrigid.

Take any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ such that the pairs (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi\circ\sigma)$ are conjugate. Then there is a birational map $\rho\colon X \dashrightarrow X$ such that

$$\upsilon \circ \sigma\big(g\big) = \rho \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \rho^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$ by Theorem B.6. Then $\rho \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$, because X is G-birationally superrigid. Put

$$\hat{G} = \big\langle G, \rho\big\rangle,$$

where we identify the subgroup $\upsilon(G)$ with the group G. Then $\hat{G}$ is a finite subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X)$, which implies that $\hat{G} = G$, because $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X) = G$ if $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, and

$$\mathrm{Aut}\big(X\big) = \mathrm{Aut}^G\big(X\big) \cong \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$$

if $X \not\cong \mathbb{P}^2$. Then $\rho \in G$, which means that σ is an inner isomorphism of the group G. □

Theorem B.10. Suppose that $G \cong \mathbb{A}_6$. Then

- $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ and X is G-birationally superrigid,
- the subgroup G is conjugate to a subgroup that leaves invariant the curve

$$10x^3y^3 + 9zx^5 + 9zy^5 + 27z^6 = 45x^2y^2z^2 + 135xyz^4 \subset \mathbb{P}^2 \cong \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x, y, z\big]\Big), \tag{B.11}$$

- for every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, the following conditions are equivalent:
  - the pairs (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi \circ \sigma)$ are conjugate,
  - the isomorphism σ is an inner isomorphism.

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem B.8, we see that

$$X \cong \mathbb{P}^2,$$

and G is conjugate to a subgroup that leaves invariant the curve B.11.

It follows from Theorem A.20 that X is G-birationally superrigid.

Let C be the curve B.9. Then we may assume that C is G-invariant.

Let ρ be any element in $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X)$, and let g be any element in G. Then

$$g\Big(\rho(C)\Big) = \rho\Big(g'(C)\Big) = \rho(C)$$

for some $g' \in G$. But C is the only sextic curve in $\mathbb{P}^2$ that is G-invariant. Then

$$\rho\big(C\big) = C,$$

which implies that $\rho \in G$, because $G \cong \mathrm{Aut}(C)$.

Now arguing as in the proof of Theorem B.8, we conclude the proof. ☐

Theorem B.12. Suppose that $G \cong \mathbb{A}_5$. Then

- for every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, the pairs (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi \circ \sigma)$ are conjugate,
- one of the following possibilities holds:
  - X is a blow up of $\mathbb{P}^2$ at any four points in general position, the variety S is a point, the surface X is G-birationally superrigid, and $\mathrm{Aut}(X) \cong \mathbb{S}_5$,
  - $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$, the variety X is G-birationally rigid, and
  $$\mathbb{A}_5 \cong \mathrm{Aut}^{\mathbb{A}_5}\Big(\mathbb{P}^2\Big) \subsetneq \mathrm{Bir}^{\mathbb{A}_5}\Big(\mathbb{P}^2\Big) \cong \mathbb{S}_5,$$
  - $X \cong \mathbb{F}_n$, where $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and n is even, there is a birational map $\rho\colon X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ that induces the monomorphism $\bar{\upsilon}\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ such that
  $$\bar{\upsilon}\big(g\big) = \rho \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \rho^{-1}$$
  for every $g \in G$, and $\bar{\upsilon}$ is induced by the product action of $\mathbb{A}_5 \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Note that the assertions of Theorems B.8, B.10 and B.12 solves Problems B.1 and B.4 for

$$G \in \Big\{\mathbb{A}_5, \mathbb{A}_6, \mathbb{PSL}\Big(2, \mathbb{F}_7\Big)\Big\}.$$

In the rest of this section we prove Theorem B.12. Suppose that $G \cong \mathbb{A}_5$.

Lemma B.13. One of the following possibilities holds:

- the variety S is a point and
  - either $K_X^2 = 5$,
  - or $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$,
- $S \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $X \cong \mathbb{F}_n$, where $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Proof. If the variety S is a point, then either $K_X^2 = 5$ or $X \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ (see [13]). If $S \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, then

$$X \cong \mathbb{F}_n$$

by [13, Lemma 5.6], where $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. ☐

Note that if the equality $K_X^2=5$ holds and the variety S is a point, then

$$\mathrm{Aut}\big(X\big)\cong\mathbb{S}_5$$

and X is a blow up of $\mathbb{P}^2$ at four points in general position (see [27], [13]).

Lemma B.14. Suppose that $K_X^2=5$ and S is a point. Then

- for every $\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}(G)$, the pairs (G,ϕ) and $(G,\phi\circ\sigma)$ are conjugate,
- the surface X is G-birationally superrigid.

Proof. The surface X is G-birationally superrigid by Theorem A.24. It is well-known that

$$\mathrm{Aut}\big(G\big)\cong\mathbb{S}_5,$$

and every element in $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is induced by an inner isomorphism of the group $\mathbb{S}_5$, which implies that the pairs (G,ϕ) and $(G,\phi\circ\sigma)$ are conjugate for every $\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}(G)$. ☐

Note that if $X\cong\mathbb{P}^2$, then the embedding

$$\mathbb{A}_5\cong G\subset\mathrm{Aut}\big(X\big)\cong\mathbb{PSL}\Big(3,\mathbb{C}\Big)$$

is induced by a three-dimensional representation of the group $\mathbb{A}_5$.

Lemma B.15. Suppose that $X\cong\mathbb{P}^2$. Then

- the variety X is G-birationally rigid, and
$$\mathbb{A}_5\cong\mathrm{Aut}^G\big(X\big)\subsetneq\mathrm{Bir}^G\big(X\big)\cong\mathbb{S}_5,$$
- for every $\sigma\in\mathrm{Aut}(G)$, the pairs (G,ϕ) and $(G,\phi\circ\sigma)$ are conjugate.

Proof. It follows from [32] that we can assume that the embedding $G\subset\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^2)$ induces the action of the group G on the ring $\mathbb{C}[x,y,z]$ such that the ring $\mathbb{C}[x,y,z]^G$ is generated by

$$f_2\big(x,y,z\big)=x^2+yz,\ \ f_6\big(x,y,z\big)=8x^4yz-2x^2y^2z^2-x\Big(y^5+z^5\Big)+y^3z^3,$$

$$f_{10}\big(x,y,z\big)=320x^6y^2z^2-160x^4y^3z^3+20x^2y^4z^4+6y^5z^5-4x\Big(y^5+z^5\Big)\Big(32x^4-20x^2yz+5y^2z^2\Big)+y^{10}+z^{10},$$

$$f_{15}\big(x,y,z\big)=x\Big(y^{10}-z^{10}\Big)\Big(352x^4-160x^2yz-10y^2z^2\Big)+\Big(y^5-z^5\Big)\Big(3840x^8yz-1024x^{10}\Big)-$$
$$-\Big(y^5-z^5\Big)\Big(3840x^6y^2z^2+1200x^4y^3z^3-100x^2y^4z^4+y^{10}+z^{10}+2y^5z^5\Big).$$

It follows from [32] that the forms f_2, f_6, f_{10} and f_{15} are related by the equation

$$f_{15}^4=-1728f_6^5+f_{10}^3+720f_2f_6^3f_{10}-80f_2^2f_6f_{10}^2+64f_2^3\Big(5f_6^2-f_2f_{10}\Big)^2.$$

Note that every G-semi-invariant polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[x,y,z]$ must be also G-invariant, because the group G is simple. In particular, there are no G-invariant curves in $\mathbb{P}^2$ of degree 1, 3 and 5.

Let $C\subset\mathbb{P}^2$ be the curve that is given by the equation

$$f_2\big(x,y,z\big)=0\subset\mathbb{P}^2\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x,y,z\big]\Big),$$

and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the pencil on $\mathbb{P}^2$ that is given by the equation

$$\lambda f_2^3\big(x,y,z\big)+\mu f_6\big(x,y,z\big)=0,$$

where $[\lambda:\mu]\in\mathbb{P}^1$. Then the following assertions hold:

- the curve C is unique G-invariant conic on $\mathbb{P}^2$,
- the action of $G\cong\mathbb{A}_5$ on $C\cong\mathbb{P}^1$ induces an embedding $C\subset\mathrm{Aut}(C)$,
- every G-invariant sextic curve on $\mathbb{P}^2$ belongs to the pencil $\mathcal{P}$,
- all curves in the pencil $\mathcal{P}$ are irreducible and reduced except the following curves:
    - the non-reduced curve that is given by the equation $f_2^3(x,y,z)=0$,

- a reduced reducible curve consisting of 6 lines $L_1, \ldots, L_6$ such that the set
$$C \cap \Big(L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4 \cup L_5 \cup L_6\Big)$$
is the unique G-orbit contained in C that consists of 12 points (cf. [30]),

- every G-orbit in $\mathbb{P}^2$ consists of at least 6 points,
- there is a unique curve $R \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $|\mathrm{Sing}(R)| = 6$, and the subset
$$\mathrm{Sing}\big(R\big) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$$
is the only G-orbit consisting of 6 points.

Take any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$. Then σ is induced by an inner isomorphism of $\mathbb{S}_5$. Thus, if
$$\mathrm{Bir}^G\big(X\big) \cong \mathbb{S}_5,$$
then the pairs (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi \circ \sigma)$ are conjugate.

Let ρ be any element in $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X)$, and let g be any element in G. Then
$$g \circ \rho = \rho \circ g'$$
for some $g' \in G$. Then
$$g\Big(\rho(C)\Big) = \rho\Big(g'(C)\Big) = \rho(C),$$
which implies that $\rho(C) = C$. There is unique G-orbit $\Lambda \subset C$ such that $|\Lambda| = 12$. Then
$$g\Big(\rho(\Lambda)\Big) = \rho\Big(g'(\Lambda)\Big) = \rho(\Lambda),$$
which implies that $\rho(\Lambda) = \Lambda$. The subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(C)$ that leaves invariant the set Λ is finite, which implies that $\rho \in G$. Thus, we see that $\mathrm{Aut}^G(X) = G$.

To complete the proof, we must show that X is G-birationally rigid and $\mathrm{Bir}^G(X) \cong \mathbb{S}_5$.

Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a G-orbit such that $|\Sigma| \leqslant 9$. Then it follows from [30] or [32] that
$$\Sigma \cap C = \varnothing,$$
and $|\Sigma| = 6$ (cf. Section 6). Then Σ is uniquely defined by the equality $|\Sigma| = 6$.

Let $\gamma\colon W \to X$ be a blow up of all points in Σ. Then it follows from [16, Proposition 1] that
$$\mathrm{Aut}\big(W\big) \cong \mathbb{S}_5,$$
and W is isomorphic to the Clebsch cubic surface (see [13]). Put
$$\tau = \gamma \circ \theta \circ \gamma^{-1},$$
where θ is an odd involution in $\mathrm{Aut}(W) \cong \mathbb{S}_5$. Then $\tau \notin \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^2)$.

The involution τ induces the monomorphism $\upsilon'\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^2)$ such that
$$\upsilon'\big(g\big) = \tau \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \tau^{-1}$$
for every $g \in G$. Then υ' is induced by a three-dimensional representation of the group $\mathbb{A}_5$ that is different from the representation that induces the monomorphism υ (cf. [13, Section 9]).

Let E be the reduced γ-exceptional divisor such that $\gamma(E) = \Sigma$. Then there is a commutative diagram
$$\begin{tikzcd} & W \arrow[dl, "\gamma"'] \arrow[dr, "\psi"] & \\ \mathbb{P}^2 \arrow[rr, dashed, "\tau"'] & & \mathbb{P}^2, \end{tikzcd}$$
where ψ is a blow down of the curve $\theta(E)$ to the set Σ (cf. proof of Theorem A.24).

If the group generated by τ untwists all G-maximal singularities (see Definition A.21), then
$$\mathrm{Bir}^G\big(X\big) = \Big\langle \mathrm{Aut}^G\big(X\big), \tau\Big\rangle \cong \mathbb{S}_5$$

by Corollary A.22, and X is G-birationally rigid by Corollary A.17. Hence, to complete the proof, we must show that the group generated by τ untwists all G-maximal singularities.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a G-invariant linear system on the surface X such that

- the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ does not have fixed curves,
- the log pair $(X, \mu\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical at some point $O \in X$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X + \mu\mathcal{M} \equiv 0.$$

Let Δ be the G-orbit of the point O. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(\mathcal{M}\big) > \frac{1}{\mu}$$

for every point $P \in \Delta$. Let M_1 and M_2 be general curves in $\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$\frac{9}{\mu^2} = \frac{K_X^2}{\mu^2} = M_1 \cdot M_2 \geqslant \sum_{P \in \Delta} \mathrm{mult}_P\Big(M_1 \cdot M_2\Big) \geqslant \sum_{P \in \Delta} \mathrm{mult}_P\big(M_1\big)\mathrm{mult}_P\big(M_2\big) = \sum_{P \in \Delta} \mathrm{mult}^2_P\big(\mathcal{M}\big) > \frac{|\Delta|}{\mu^2},$$

which implies that $|\Delta| < 9$. Then $\Delta = \Sigma$. Put $H = \gamma^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1))$. Then

$$\begin{cases} \theta^*\big(H\big) \sim 5H - 2E, \\ \theta^*\big(E\big) \sim 12H - 5E, \end{cases} \qquad \text{(B.16)}$$

because the involution θ acts non-trivially on $\mathrm{Pic}(W)$.

Put $\mathcal{M}' = \tau(\mathcal{M})$. Let μ' be a positive rational number such that the equivalence

$$K_X + \mu'\mathcal{M}' \equiv 0$$

holds. Then it follows from the equivalences B.16 that

$$\mu' = \frac{3}{15/\mu - 12\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big)},$$

which implies that $\mu' > \mu$. Similarly, it follows from the equivalences B.16 that

$$\mathrm{mult}_P\big(\mathcal{M}'\big) = \frac{6}{\mu} - 5\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\mathcal{M}\big),$$

for every point $P \in \Sigma$. Then the log pair $(X, \mu'\mathcal{M}')$ is canonical at every point of the set Σ.

Arguing as above, we see that the singularities of the log pair $(X, \mu'\mathcal{M}')$ are canonical everywhere, which implies that the group generated by τ untwists all G-maximal singularities. ☐

To complete the proof of Theorem B.12, we may assume that $X \cong \mathbb{F}_n$, where $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Lemma B.17. Suppose that there are monomorphism $\iota\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1)$, a non-inner isomorphism $\nu \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, and a birational map $\chi\colon X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ such that

$$\chi \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \chi^{-1}\Big(a, b\Big) = \Bigg(\iota\big(g\big)\Big(a\Big), \iota \circ \nu\big(g\big)\Big(b\Big)\Bigg)$$

for every $g \in G$ and $(a, b) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi \circ \sigma)$ are conjugate for any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$.

Proof. The birational map χ induces the monomorphism $\grave{\upsilon}\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ such that

$$\grave{\upsilon}\big(g\big) = \chi \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \chi^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$. Then $\grave{\upsilon}$ is induced by the twisted diagonal action of the group $\mathbb{A}_5$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Let us identify the subgroup $\grave{\upsilon}(G)$ with the group G.

Take $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ such that $\tau(a, b) = (b, a)$ for any $(a, b) \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then

$$\big\langle G, \tau \big\rangle \cong \mathbb{S}_5,$$

which implies that the pairs (G, ϕ) and $(G, \phi \circ \sigma)$ are conjugate for every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, because every isomorphism of the group $\mathbb{A}_5$ is induced by an inner isomorphism of the group $\mathbb{S}_5$. ☐

Therefore, to complete the proof of Theorem B.12, we may ignore any difference between the monomorphism υ and $\upsilon \circ \sigma$, where $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$.

Lemma B.18. Suppose that $n \neq 0$. Then n is even, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, dashed, "\rho"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[d, "\bar{\pi}"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[r, equal] & \mathbb{P}^1,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ρ is a birational map that induces the monomorphism $\bar{\upsilon} \colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ such that

$$\bar{\upsilon}\big(g\big) = \rho \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \rho^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$, and $\bar{\upsilon}$ is induced by the product action of the group $\mathbb{A}_5 \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof. Let Z be the section of π such that $Z^2 = -n$. Then Z is G-invariant.

The curve Z contains G-orbits consisting of 12, 20 and 30 points (see [30]).

Let Σ be the G-orbit such that $\Sigma \subset Z$ and $|\Sigma| = 30$. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & U \arrow[dl, "\alpha"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta"] & \\
X \arrow[rr, dashed, "\psi"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & & X_1 \arrow[d, "\pi_1"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[rr, equal] & & \mathbb{P}^1,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ψ is a birational map, π_1 is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle, α is the blow up of the set Σ, and β is the blow down of the proper transforms of the fibers of π that pass through the points of the set Σ.

The birational map ψ induces the monomorphism $\upsilon_1 \colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X_1)$ such that

$$\upsilon_1\big(g\big) = \psi \circ \upsilon\big(g\big) \circ \psi^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$. Let us identify the subgroup $\upsilon_1(G)$ with the group G. Put $Z_1 = \psi(Z)$. Then

$$Z_1 \cdot Z_1 = Z \cdot Z - 30 = -n - 30 < 0,$$

which implies that $X_1 \cong \mathbb{F}_{n+30}$ and Z_1 is G-invariant.

The curve Z_1 contains G-orbits consisting of 12, 20 and 30 points (see [30]).

Let Σ_1 be the G-orbit such that $\Sigma_1 \subset Z_1$ and

$$\big|\Sigma_1\big| = 20,$$

let P_1 be a point in Σ_1, let H_1 be the stabilizer in G of the point P_1. Then $H_1 \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$.

Let L_1 be the fiber of π_1 such that $P_1 \in L_1$. Then

$$h_1\big(L_1\big) = L_1$$

for every $h_1 \in H_1$. Then there is a point $Q_1 \in L_1 \setminus P_1$ such that $h_1(Q_1) = Q_1$ for every $h_1 \in H_1$.

Let Λ_1 be the G-orbit of the point Q_1. Then $|\Lambda_1| = 20$ and

$$\Lambda_1 \cap Z_1 = \varnothing,$$

because Z_1 is G-invariant and $Q_1 \notin Z_1$. Thus, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & U_1 \arrow[dl, "\alpha_1"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta_1"] & \\
X_1 \arrow[rr, dashed, "\psi_1"] \arrow[d, "\pi_1"'] & & X_2 \arrow[d, "\pi_2"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[rr, equal] & & \mathbb{P}^1,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ψ_1 is a birational map, π_2 is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle, α_1 is the blow up of the set Λ_1, and β_1 is the blow down of the proper transforms of the fibers of π_1 that pass through the points of the set Λ_1.

The birational map ψ_1 induces the monomorphism $\upsilon_2\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X_2)$ such that

$$\upsilon_2\big(g\big) = \psi_1 \circ \upsilon_1\big(g\big) \circ \psi_1^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$. Let us identify the subgroup $\upsilon_2(G)$ with the group G. Put $Z_2 = \psi_1(Z_1)$. Then

$$Z_2 \cdot Z_2 = Z_1 \cdot Z_1 + 20 = Z \cdot Z - 30 + 20 = -n - 10 < 0,$$

which implies that $X_2 \cong \mathbb{F}_{n+10}$ and Z_2 is G-invariant.

The curve Z_2 contains G-orbits consisting of 12, 20 and 30 points (see [30]).

Let Σ_2 be the G-orbit such that $\Sigma_2 \subset Z_2$ and

$$\big|\Sigma_1\big| = 12,$$

let P_2 be a point in Σ_2, let H_2 be the stabilizer in G of the point P_2. Then $H_2 \cong \mathbb{Z}_5$.

Let L_2 be the fiber of π_2 such that $P_2 \in L_2$. Then

$$h_2\big(L_2\big) = L_2$$

for every $h_2 \in H_2$. Then there is a point $Q_2 \in L_2 \setminus P_2$ such that $h_2(Q_2) = Q_2$ for every $h_2 \in H_2$.

Let Λ_2 be the G-orbit of the point Q_2. Then $|\Lambda_2| = 12$ and

$$\Lambda_2 \cap Z_2 = \varnothing,$$

because Z_2 is G-invariant and $Q_2 \notin Z_2$. Thus, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & U_2 \arrow[dl, "\alpha_2"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta_2"] & \\
X_2 \arrow[rr, dashed, "\psi_2"] \arrow[d, "\pi_2"'] & & X' \arrow[d, "\pi'"] \\
\mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[rr, equal] & & \mathbb{P}^1,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ψ_2 is a birational map, π' is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle, α_2 is the blow up of the set Λ_2, and β_2 is the blow down of the proper transforms of the fibers of π_2 that pass through the points of the set Λ_2.

The birational map ψ_2 induces the monomorphism $\upsilon'\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X')$ such that

$$\upsilon'\big(g\big) = \psi_2 \circ \upsilon_3\big(g\big) \circ \psi_2^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$. Let us identify the subgroup $\upsilon'(G)$ with the group G. Put $Z' = \psi_2(Z_2)$. Then

$$Z' \cdot Z' = Z_2 \cdot Z_2 + 12 = Z_1 \cdot Z_1 + 20 + 12 = Z \cdot Z - 30 + 20 + 12 = -n + 2 \leqslant 0,$$

and the curve Z' is a G-invariant section of π'. Note that $X' \cong \mathbb{F}_{n-2}$.

Put $\nu = \psi_2 \circ \psi_1 \circ \psi$. Then $(X', \xi \circ \nu, \upsilon')$ is a regularization of the pair (G, ϕ).

So far, we constructed the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[r, dashed, "\nu"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & X' \arrow[d, "\pi'"] \\ \mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[r, equal] & \mathbb{P}^1, \end{tikzcd}$$

where ν is a birational map, π' is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle, $X' \cong \mathbb{F}_{n-2}$, there is a section Z' of π' such that

$$Z' \cdot Z' = -n + 2$$

and Z' is G-invariant. If $n = 2$, then we are done. Similarly, we see that $n \neq 3$. Then $n \geqslant 4$. Repeating the above construction $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ times, we conclude the proof. $\square$

Thus, to complete the proof of Theorem B.12, we may assume that $n = 0$. Then

$$X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1,$$

and we may assume that $\pi\colon \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1$ is a projection to the first factor.

Lemma B.19. Suppose that there is a G-invariant section Z of the fibration π. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[r, dashed, "\rho"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[d, "\bar{\pi}"] \\ \mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[r, equal] & \mathbb{P}^1, \end{tikzcd}$$

where ρ is a birational map that induces the monomorphism $\bar{\upsilon}\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ such that

$$\bar{\upsilon}(g) = \rho \circ \upsilon(g) \circ \rho^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$, and $\bar{\upsilon}$ is induced by the product action of the group $\mathbb{A}_5 \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof. Let Σ be a G-orbit such that $\Sigma \subset Z$ and $|\Sigma| = 60$. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} & U \arrow[dl, "\alpha"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta"] & \\ X \arrow[rr, dashed, "\psi"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & & X' \arrow[d, "\pi'"] \\ \mathbb{P}^1 \arrow[rr, equal] & & \mathbb{P}^1, \end{tikzcd}$$

where ψ is a birational map, π' is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle, α is the blow up of the set Σ, and β is the blow down of the proper transforms of the fibers of π that pass through the points of the set Σ.

The birational map ψ induces the monomorphism $\upsilon'\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X')$ such that

$$\upsilon'(g) = \psi \circ \upsilon(g) \circ \psi^{-1}$$

for every $g \in G$. Let us identify the subgroup $\upsilon'(G)$ with the group G. Put $Z' = \psi(Z)$. Then

$$Z' \cdot Z' = Z \cdot Z - 60,$$

the curve Z' is a section of π', and the curve Z' is G-invariant.

Put $m = -Z' \cdot Z'$. If $m \geqslant 0$, then $X' \cong \mathbb{F}_m$ and we are done by Lemma B.18.

If $m < 0$, then we can repeat the above construction $\lceil m/60 \rceil$ times to complete the proof. $\square$

Let τ be the biregular involution of $\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$ such that

$$\tau\big(a,b\big)=\big(b,a\big)$$

for every $(a,b)\in\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Then τ induces the monomorphism $\upsilon'\colon G\to\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1)$ such that

$$\upsilon'\big(g\big)=\tau\circ\upsilon\big(g\big)\circ\tau$$

for every $g\in G$. Then $(\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1,\xi\circ\tau,\upsilon')$ is a regularization of the pair (G,ϕ).

Lemma B.20. The following assertions are equivalent:

- the monomorphism υ is induces by the product action of $\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{P}^1}\times\mathbb{A}_5$,
- the monomorphism υ' is induces by the product action of $\mathbb{A}_5\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$.

Proof. The required assertion is obvious. □

Let us fix a monomorphism of groups $\iota\colon G\to\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1)$, and let us fix some non-inner isomorphism $\nu\in\mathrm{Aut}(G)$. It follows from Lemmas B.17, B.19 and B.20 that we may assume that

$$\upsilon(g)\big(a,b\big)=\Big(\iota(g)\big(a\big),\iota\circ\nu(g)\big(b\big)\Big)$$

for every $g\in G$ and every $(a,b)\in\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$.

Lemma B.21. There is a G-invariant section of the projection π.

Proof. Explicit computations shows that there is a G-invariant curve $Z\subset\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$ such that

$$Z\sim\pi^*\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(7)\Big)\otimes\big(\pi\circ\tau\big)^*\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)\Big),$$

which implies that Z is a G-invariant section of the projection π. □

The assertion of Theorem B.12 is proved.

References

[1] S. Bannai, H. Tokunaga, *A note on embeddings of $\mathbb{S}_4$ and $\mathbb{A}_5$ into the two-dimensional Cremona group and versal Galois covers*
Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences **43** (2007), 1111–1123

[2] C. Birkar, P. Cascini, C. Hacon, J. McKernan, *Existence of minimal models for varieties of log general type*
arXiv:math/0610203 (2006)

[3] J. Blanc, *Sous–groupes algebriques du groupe de Cremona*
Transformation Groups **14** (2009), 249–285

[4] I. Cheltsov, *Birationally rigid Fano varieties*
Russian Mathematical Surveys **60** (2005), 875–965

[5] I. Cheltsov, *Log canonical thresholds of del Pezzo surfaces*
Geometric and Functional Analysis, **18** (2008), 1118–1144

[6] I. Cheltsov, *Fano varieties with many selfmaps*
Advances in Mathematics **217** (2008), 97–124

[7] I. Cheltsov, *On singular cubic surfaces*
Asian Journal of Mathematics **19** (2009), 191–214

[8] I. Cheltsov, C. Shramov, *Log canonical thresholds of smooth Fano threefolds*
Russian Mathematical Surveys **63** (2008), 859-958

[9] I. Cheltsov, J. Park, C. Shramov, *Exceptional del Pezzo hypersurfaces*
arXiv:math.AG/0810.2704

[10] A. Corti, *Singularities of linear systems and threefold birational geometry*
L.M.S. Lecture Note Series **281** (2000), 259–312

[11] A. Corti, M. Mella, *Birational geometry of terminal quartic 3-folds I*
American Journal of Mathematics **126** 4 (2004), 739–761

[12] J.-P. Demailly, J. Kollár, *Semi-continuity of complex singularity exponents and Kähler–Einstein metrics on Fano orbifolds*
Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure **34** (2001), 525–556

[13] I. Dolgachev, V. Iskovskikh, *Finite subgroups of the plane Cremona group*
arXiv:math.AG/0610595 (2006)

[14] W. Edge, *A pencil of four-nodal plane sextics*
Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **89** (1981), 413–421

[15] T. Graber, J. Harris, J. Starr, *Families of rationally connected varieties*
Journal of the American Mathematical Society **16** (2003), 57–67

[16] N. Hitchin, *Spherical harmonics and the icosahedron*
arXiv:math.AG/0706.0088

[17] V. Iskovskikh, *Birational rigidity of Fano hypersurfaces in the framework of Mori theory*
Russian Mathematical Surveys **56** (2001), 207–291

[18] Yu. Kawamata, K. Matsuda, K. Matsuki, *Introduction to the minimal model problem*
Algebraic geometry, Advanced Studies in Oure Mathematics **10** (1987), 283–360

[19] J. Kollár et al., *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*
Astérisque **211** (1992)

[20] J. Kollár, *Singularities of pairs*
Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **62** (1997), 221–287

[21] J. Kollár, *Birational rigidity of Fano varieties and field extensions*
Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics **264** (2009), 96-101

[22] D. Kosta, *Del Pezzo surfaces with Du Val singularities*
arXiv:0904.0943 (2009)

[23] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry* **II**
Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004

[24] A. Pukhlikov, *Birational automorphisms of Fano hypersurfaces*
Inventiones Mathematicae **134** (1998), 401–426

[25] A. Pukhlikov, *Birational automorphisms of algebraic threefolds with a pencil of del Pezzo surfaces*
Izvestiya: Mathematics **62** (1998), 115–155

[26] A. Pukhlikov, *Birational geometry of Fano direct products*
Izvestiya: Mathematics **69** (2005), 1225–1255

[27] J. Rauschning, P. Slodowy, *An aspect of icosahedral symmetry*
Canadian Mathematical Bulletin **45** (2005), 686–696

[28] M. Rosenlicht, *Some basic theorems on algebraic groups*
American Journal of Mathematics **78** (1956), 401–443

[29] V. Shokurov, *Three-fold log flips*
Russian Academy of Sciences, Izvestiya Mathematics **40** (1993), 95–202

[30] T. Springer, *Invariant theory*
Lecture Notes in Mathematics **585** (1977), Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York

[31] G. Tian, *On Kähler–Einstein metrics on certain Kähler manifolds with* $c_1(M) > 0$
Inventiones Mathematicae **89** (1987), 225–246

[32] S. Yau, Y. Yu, *Gorenstein quotient singularities in dimension three*
Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society **505** (1993), Providence

[33] Q. Zhang, *Rational connectedness of log* $\mathbb{Q}$*-Fano varietiess*
Journal fur die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik **590** (2006), 131–142

School of Mathematics
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, UK

I.Cheltsov@ed.ac.uk